

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE latest of Professor Kirsopp LAKE's published volumes contains the lectures given at Oberlin College in 1919 on the Haskell Foundation. Its title is *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). In that volume he says: 'If the history of religion has any clear lesson, it is that a nearer approach to truth is always a departure from orthodoxy.'

What does that mean? That Professor Kirsopp LAKE is out of touch with the Nicene Creed? He is, somewhat glaringly. But it cannot mean that, for his business is not with theology. He is a critic and historian of early Christianity. It can only mean that already he is out of touch with the majority of New Testament scholars, and that he is proud of it.

But he is more than out of touch. He is out of reach of the scholarship of his time. He is almost, if not altogether, as far away already as van Manen was in his day. He reduces the Christianity of the Early Church to a very commonplace affair. If it conquered the pagan world it did so through its defects.

'The Church,' he says, 'conquered the world by offering salvation through a redeeming Lord. Jesus made no such offer.' 'Nor is there much more truth in the attribution of its success to the

influence of the personality of Jesus.' 'Not the men who had known Jesus, but those who had not, converted the Roman Empire, and their gospel was that of the Cross, Resurrection, and Parousia, not the Sermon on the Mount, or an ethical interpretation of the Parables, or a moral *imitatio Christi*.'

It is as if a child had gone out unarmed to meet a well-equipped warrior and when he returned victorious we were told that his victory was due to defective eyesight. For to Professor LAKE the Cross, Resurrection, and Parousia are all defects in a Christianity that ought to be simply ethical.

Christ Himself, according to Professor LAKE, was a quite ordinary person. His 'thoughts and words, like those of Origen, were borrowed from his own time and race; they belong to the first century as those of Origen belong to the third.' And the teacher of the present century will not always agree with him. 'He will often appear to contradict the thought or the language of Jesus or of Paul or of Origen, but he will be loyal to the purpose which was theirs, and yet so much more than theirs.'

All this is uttered with an air of authority, as if it were the last word of exact scholarship. But the scholarship is by no means overwhelming.

For his knowledge of Rabbinism, Professor LAKE has apparently to depend upon so popular a writer as Mr. Claude Montefiore. In any case it is not scholarship that brings him to his conclusions, it is bad reasoning.

The most amazing example is found in the long discussion of the Pre-existence of Christ. More immediately manifest, however, is the use made of our Lord's reference to the 110th Psalm and its authorship. Twice Professor LAKE uses that reference. First he says: 'The question of Jesus to the Pharisees, how David in the Scriptures could call the Messiah Lord if he were his son, is pointless, except on the assumption that Jesus did not regard himself as the Son of David.' And a few pages later: 'It was wrong and futile to pretend that when he said "David said" and quoted a psalm, he did not mean to ascribe it to David.'

Is it worth while refuting these fallacies? It would certainly be easy to show that men of as reliable a scholarship as Professor LAKE'S have held that in speaking of the 110th Psalm as David's, Jesus was simply referring the Pharisees to their own interpretation of it. Will Professor LAKE tell us what necessity there was or what opportunity for anything else?

Persistent belittling of the Christ of the Gospels is poor occupation for a historian. Does Professor Kirsopp LAKE deserve the name? What historical insight or imagination can he have who believes that Christianity got even its start from the Christ of his conception? What real knowledge can he possess, who, in the victory of Christianity over the pagan empire of Rome, allows no place for the influence of Christ's personality?

Dr. W. E. ORCHARD has been brave enough to offer us a new theory of the Atonement. And in a sermon. His sermons are certainly never addressed to children. In the new volume, *The*

Safest Mind Cure (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), every one is of full length and full intellectual demand. But only in one has he been courageous enough to offer a new theory of a great theological doctrine.

It is a social theory. If it is accepted it will be known as the Social Theory of the Atonement. And just because it is social it is likely enough to be accepted. For we are all assured at present that the man who is satisfied with the salvation of his own soul has not a soul worth saving. We are all preaching the social value of Christianity.

Dr. ORCHARD begins well. He begins with an undeniable historical fact. That fact is that 'the death of Jesus was actually occasioned by a coalition of political tendencies which demanded His removal as a danger or a hindrance; and these forces combined in delivering Him over to death.'

'The first of these was the social ideals of the religious leaders. Caiaphas is sometimes conceived as a human monster because he stooped to discreditable means in order to compass the extinction of Jesus. But he excused his actions upon the simple plea that at all costs the nation must be preserved. The teaching of Jesus was being misinterpreted by the common people, it was detested by the ruling classes, and the inevitable result would be a general rising, which would bring the Romans down upon them and take away their place and nation. Caiaphas therefore argued that it was a case of justice for one man or the continuance of the State. To get rid of Jesus would involve injustice, for Caiaphas knew as well as any one that the teaching of Jesus was not directed against the rulers in Church or State. It would have to be accomplished by treachery and false witness, but national necessity knows no law.'

'The second force was the policy of the State rulers. Pilate is often condemned as a hopeless coward, and his weakness traced to the fear of

Tiberius. But there was something more than that at work. He was there to see that Caesar's rule was maintained; and the claims of Jesus to Messiahship introduced dangerous complications. Pilate knew perfectly well that the claim of Jesus was politically innocuous, but practically it was subversive. The Roman Government had no room for a Messiah Prince. Pilate was not judging wrongly, as the final conflict between Christianity and the Empire afterwards revealed.'

'And the third force was the policy of the revolutionaries. It is a fact that the crucifixion of Jesus was able to be carried out because at the last the mob turned against Him. We might dismiss this as of not much significance, because the mob were worked up by false charges made by religious leaders, and were carried away by the blood lust which can so easily be roused. But there was something behind which made this possible. They had already been disappointed in Jesus. The Zealots of Galilee were working for a political and social revolution, and when Christ refused to adopt what they conceived to be the only practical means of bringing this about, namely, accepting political leadership and advocating violence, they let Him go to His death undefended, significantly choosing Barabbas, who was a seditious leader evidently ready for any violence.'

Now these forces, Dr. ORCHARD wants us to observe, 'were not morally wicked or socially abnormal; they were the forces of nationalism, government, and social aspiration. The people who compassed the death of Jesus were the best elements in Church, State, and People. And the excuses they used were such as have been used over and over again by patriots anxious to preserve nationality, officials responsible for order, and revolutionaries clamouring for reform. It was the combined interests of national security, imperial policy, and political freedom that brought the Son of God to death. To a world organized upon this basis He was an impossible person. He was therefore put to death under the Law in a sense

wider than St. Paul perhaps realized: the law of ordered society.'

Well, when we consider that—and it seems difficult to deny it—we cannot help seeing one thing very clearly. If Christ were to come among us to-day He would be crucified over again. Would the patriot let Him off? Or the imperialist? Or the social reformer?

But Dr. ORCHARD's point is not that. His point is that Jesus suffered on the Cross, not as a substitute for the individual or as the victim of an offended Deity, or on any other theory of the Atonement yet suggested, but as the inevitable result of being in the way of the social needs and aspirations of mankind.

And if that is so, it follows that we must repent of our social needs and aspirations. Dr. ORCHARD does not shrink from demanding the repentance. For 'if we track the mistakes of nationalism, imperialism, and revolutionism down to their moral basis, what is wrong with them is seen to be simply this: pride, national pride; fear, fear which demands forceful protection; unbelief, unbelief in the convertibility of men save by threats and violence. Is there any sociologist, advanced thinker, pacifist, who thinks himself free of these root causes? How many advanced theorists are themselves only a hindrance to the cause they advocate; how many who are pacifist on national issues live by quite different principles in their relationship with others; and how many who deprecate violence and bloody revolution are by their lack of a constructive alternative, sacrificing example, or personal faith, really inviting that type of revolution as the only practical course. Personal pride, fear of our fellows, unbelief in the power of God over the human heart; these have only to be worked out to social magnitudes and they end always in the crucifixion of the Son of God. Society but embodies in gigantic crimes the inevitable results of the weaknesses and failings and sins of the human heart.'

If it is true that there is less apologetic in the pulpit than there used to be, the reason is not only because it has been found more profitable to preach the gospel than to 'apologize' for it. A potent reason is the consciousness that arguments which touch philosophy or science can no longer be used without an intimate and up-to-date knowledge of those departments of study.

That knowledge does not involve specializing in science or in philosophy. If it did, no preacher could ever be an apologist. But it does involve acquaintance with the most modern and most reliable literature. It demands that before he approach, let us say, the Argument from Design, the preacher should read the Gifford Lectures of Professor J. Arthur THOMSON.

Professor THOMSON calls his lectures *The System of Animate Nature*. He divides the universe as known to us into three spheres, which overlap one another. One is 'the cosmosphere, from the solar system to the dew-drop, from the moon to the moonstone, from the sea to the snow-crystal—the Domain of the Inorganic.' Another is 'the biosphere, the Realm of Organisms, where the laws of matter and motion still hold, but are no longer exhaustive, since another aspect of reality has welled-up, which we call life.' The third is 'the sociosphere, the Kingdom of Man, where mechanism is in many departments transcended or sublimed, where even the science of the individual is transcended, for human beings in societies behave in a way which cannot be formulated in terms of individual Biology and Psychology.' His own business is with the biosphere. And in the exposition of that sphere he finds himself face to face with the Argument from Design.

How does it stand with the Argument from Design to-day?

'Discovering some of the thousand-and-one ways in which the structure and function of organisms

are fit for the conditions of life, many keen-sighted and reverent naturalists of older days argued directly from the adaptations to the agency of a Divine Adapter.' That is the Argument from Design. It is a scientific argument. And once it was used by scientific men. Some of the authors of the Bridgewater Treatises had an unchallenged scientific reputation. It is used by scientific men no longer.

Professor THOMSON gives three reasons. First of all, it is no longer felt necessary to call in the aid of an extraneous force in enabling an organism to make its calling and election sure. 'What the older Naturalists should have done before concluding their argument was to inquire how far the intelligence, which adaptations certainly suggest, may be resident as intelligence or some analogous form in the creatures themselves. Modern study shows that many animals work out their own salvation.'

Then there is the recognition of stages of evolutionary progress. When modern naturalists 'scrutinise the magnificent series of adaptations more closely they discern less perfect stages of them in antecedent forms of life. The eye of a fly is an extraordinary instrument, but there is a long ladder of eyes approximating to it. The community of hive-bees or of social wasps amazes us—at first almost bewilders us,—with its complexity and subtlety, but there is a long series of gradations connecting it with the life of solitary bees and wasps. Moreover, as we look around, we see that many adaptations are still in progress, and very far from perfect.'

'The third reason is, that, given a sufficient crop of variations, plenty of time, and a process of sifting, the Darwinian can give a plausible and approximate—we do not say an easy or complete—account of the way in which most of the wonderful adaptations have been evolved. The hard-shelled Darwinian says: These effective adaptations you so justly admire are the outcome of natural

tentatives and natural siftings. We assume that the forms of life are restlessly but not inconsistently variable, that they are continually offering new qualities and characters to the sieve of selection, and that the conditions of life are such that they eliminate in a very discriminating fashion the relatively less fit. If these assumptions are granted, we can account for adaptations. The immediate operation of a Divine Adapter is a hypothesis of which, we say it with the utmost reverence, we cannot scientifically make any use.'

But that is not the end of the matter. Professor THOMSON does not give up the Argument from Design. As a scientific observer he gives it up. As a philosopher, or, as he prefers to say of himself, as a religious thinker, he asserts it to be 'not outside the right of interpretation which we claim as rational beings.'

What Professor THOMSON means is this. Science does not demand a Divine Designer, but the religious consciousness does, and science does not contradict it. More than that. The scientific mind, if it is able to lift itself above the things that are seen and handled, recognizes a world which cannot be explained without the design of a Designer. 'If we free ourselves, as we think we must, from a purely mechanical evolutionism, and recognise organisms as genuine agents, we may see in the factors of evolution the relatively, though, of course, not absolutely, self-sufficient means of working out a purpose, or thought, or idea, which was involved by the Creator in the origination of the first organisms, or wherever it seems clearest to begin.'

So the Divine Designer is still to be acknowledged. The only difference is that He is now believed to follow a different method in His working. And to the mind of Professor Arthur THOMSON it is a more adorable method. 'That He—the Unmoved Prime Mover—has made things to make themselves and to go on perfecting themselves—albeit they may be never separable in

thought from Him—seems a finer kind of creation than Paley pictures. As Professor Pettigrew said in his *Design in Nature* (p. 820), "Natural Selection may be regarded merely as a process of so-called evolution by which the Creator works and accomplishes His purpose. Indeed the Creator, by conferring upon living matter in its simplest and lowest forms the power of appropriating the elements and building them up by endless elaboration and gradation from a monad to a man, proves Himself to be an infinitely more wonderful Designer than was ever dreamt of by even the most ardent teleologist."'

Dr. F. HOMES DUDDEN has issued a volume of Sermons, to which he has given the title of *The Dead and the Living* (Longmans; 5s. net). It is the title of the first sermon. And without any doubt that sermon is the most arresting in the book.

Its argument is that the dead are alive, and being alive have it in their power to do three things. They can visit the living; they can communicate with the living; they can minister to the living. These are strong statements in view of the evidence. But the man who makes them is the Master of an Oxford College.

The dead are alive. That needs no evidence. It is a revelation. The War has made it. Before the War we refused to look at death. The War compelled us to look at it. And when we looked we discovered 'that death is not, as we had thought, a plunge downwards into the darkness, but a step upwards into the light; that it is not a blank wall that blocks and closes our path of life, but simply an open passage from life to higher life.

For all is life, and death the door whose portal

We pass to enter on diviner ways;

Achieving there the work that is immortal,

With prayer transformed to praise.'

'Gradually two great convictions concerning the

condition of the departed became firmly established in our minds. The first conviction is that those whom we call the dead are not really dead at all. They are alive; they are still alive; they are very much alive; nay, they are even more alive than they ever were. The body, indeed, is dead; but the spirit, the real self, that inhabited the body and used the body as its vehicle, still lives on. That is the first conviction.'

'The second conviction is that the purely physical process of death does not destroy the individuality or involve any sudden break in the continuity of personal existence. When a man "dies" (as we say) he is still exactly the same person that he was when here. His true self is not diminished. His intelligence remains, his memory remains, his moral qualities remain, his affections remain, to a certain extent even his tastes and interests remain. Death changes, indeed, his circumstances, but it does not change his character. Thus, when he emerges into the other life, he is still exactly the same person—thinking, remembering, willing, desiring, aspiring, loving, in the same way that he was wont to do. In all essentials he is still himself—just his own familiar, individual self. That is our second conviction.'

Whereupon—if you feel these convictions, if they *are* convictions—you pass to the three Statements, that the dead visit the living, that they communicate with them, that they help them.

There is no proof offered. There is scarcely any evidence. The dead visit the living: Dr. DUDDEN is content to say, 'Is it possible to doubt it?' 'Is it conceivable that a longing, so legitimate and so natural, should be thwarted by a God who is Himself essentially Perfect Love? I do not believe it for a moment. Nay, I am sure that the dead come home.'

And he knows how they come. They come back intermittently. 'They come back, I should imagine, pretty much as a man of affairs, who has

important business in the world, comes back at intervals to his wife and children. He cannot be with them all the time. He has grave matters to attend to. He travels upon missions, he goes up and down the country, he crosses the sea, perhaps, and transacts business in distant lands. Sometimes he is away for days together; sometimes his absence is prolonged for weeks or even months. Yet, through all the days and weeks and months, the love for his own is tugging, tugging at his heart, and at the end of every journey, when the task for the moment is finished, he comes home. And so it is, I believe, with our dead. They cannot continue with us always. They have much to do, and much to learn, and many experiences to encounter; but they do not forget their own dear people, and at intervals—at far more frequent intervals, perhaps, than many of us imagine—they come home.'

But not only do they come back, they also make their presence known to us. Is Dr. DUDDEN a spiritualist, then? Certainly not. He leaves the spiritualistic phenomena to scientific experts. It is not outward communication, such as the spiritualist seeks, that Dr. DUDDEN believes in or cares for. It is inward and spiritual. 'Inwardly and spiritually, they speak to us, act on us, influence us, inspire us, bring ideas to our minds, and light up visions in our souls. Not a breath stirs the silence; but impressions are felt, intimations are received, and suggestions from unknown quarters are mysteriously telegraphed through. Yes, I am convinced that the dead communicate.'

And they minister to us. Again, Dr. DUDDEN troubles us with no proof: it is a conviction. 'Are they not, like the angels, "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation"? In manifold ways, I think, they help us. They guide, they instruct, they comfort. They insinuate beauty and truth. They strengthen whatever is good in us, and, so far as is consistent with our freedom, bend our desires and aspirations Godwards. As God's agents—I further conjecture

—they ward off malign influences from our hearts and from our homes; and sometimes, perhaps, as they increase in spirituality and receive greater gifts and endowments, they are permitted to turn aside calamities that threaten us and modify circumstances for our help.’

And then Dr. HOMES DUDDEN turns to his hearers and tells them to receive the living dead when they return. Receive them sympathetically, he says; and receive them gladly, ‘Ah! let us see to it, my brethren, that we do not grieve our dead by false conceptions and foolish prejudices about themselves and their condition. Let them find in us, when they return, nothing but faith and trust and eager hope and sympathetic comprehension.’

‘It was the beginning of the end for Jesus, and the burning of His bridges behind Him, when He took His stand on the saying, “God loves the world,” putting the accent not upon *God*, and not upon *loves*, but upon *the world*.’

That is the Rev. John A. HUTTON, D.D., in a book on *The Proposal of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Why does He put the accent on ‘the world’? Because He takes this great text as the gage of battle between Himself and the Jews. The Jews, forgetting Jonah and the Ninevites, had come to the belief that God was the God of the seed of Abraham only. We know how St. Paul had to combat that belief. Dr. HUTTON holds that Jesus met with and fought it before St. Paul. ‘Our Lord declared that God is the Father of the entire race of man, that He has no natural favourites, that he has no respect of persons, that God loves *the world*.’

Has Dr. HUTTON forgotten the story of the Syro-phenician woman? Has he forgotten the words, ‘I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel’? He has not forgotten. He passes to the story of the woman of Canaan at

once. He gives his own translation of the narrative. He gives his own interpretation.

This is the translation: ‘Leaving that place, Jesus withdrew into the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon. Here a Canaanitish woman of the district came out and persistently cried out, “Sir, Son of David, pity me. My daughter is cruelly harassed by a demon.” But He answered her not a word. Then the disciples interposed and begged Him, saying, “Send her away because she keeps crying behind us.” “I have only been sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel,” He replied. Then she came and threw herself at His feet and entreated Him; “O Sir, help me,” she said. “It is not right,” He said, “to take the children’s bread and throw it to the dogs.” “Be it so, Sir,” she said, “for even the dogs eat the scraps which fall from their masters’ tables.” “O woman,” replied Jesus, “great is your faith. Be it done to you as you desire.” And from that moment her daughter was restored to health.’

That is the story. It leaves, Dr. HUTTON thinks, a certain instinctive uneasiness in our minds. He has read the many ‘ingenious and laborious and entirely unconvincing reasons and explanations’ that have been offered for the removing of that uneasiness. Jesus, it is said, ‘purposely put difficulties in her way so that she might fall back before the face of these difficulties into a sullen acquiescence in her lot, or that her faith might be heightened or deepened by these very difficulties into an agonising cry.’

Dr. HUTTON does not believe it. He calls it ‘a horrid idea.’ It is an idea which ‘bristles with theological difficulties as it does with moral, for it would attribute to our Blessed Lord something far removed indeed from the Divine Charity which will not break a bruised reed or quench a smoking flax.’

Why, then, did He hold the woman off? Why is it recorded so emphatically that ‘he answered her

never a word'? Not for His own sake and not for hers: He did it for the sake of the disciples.

This woman was a Gentile. In the anguish of her spirit she had come to a Jew for help. 'Sir, Son of David, pity me. My daughter is cruelly harassed by a demon.' He answered her never a word. 'He was leaving the woman's question to burn its way into their Jewish hearts who were looking on and listening. He would not interrupt the controversy which had now begun in their spirits; the controversy as to what a man is to do who will still call himself a man, and what God is to do who will still call Himself God, when human weakness and pain appeal for a deliverance which man or God can render.'

But when He did speak, He said, 'I have only been sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.' What does Dr. HUTTON make of that? 'Now these,' he says, 'I firmly hold, are not His words at all. They are, so to speak, a quotation to be read within inverted commas, a quotation embodying the prevailing temper of their Jewish minds. It is as though He had said: "Well, but you know if I help this woman I shall be acting in contravention of all that you Jews believe and protest. If you really mean what you say, you mean that this woman, because she is a Canaanitish woman, is not eligible for the charity of God. That is to say, God, in your view, can close His ears and is right to close His ears to any appeal that comes from any human heart if that human heart is not a Jewish human heart."''

The meaning of it could not enter into their minds in a moment. The woman returned: 'O Sir, help me!' He held her off again. 'I think,' says Dr. HUTTON, 'it must have cost Him almost as much as the agony of Gethsemane—"It is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs."'

Is there—here is Dr. HUTTON at his height now—'is there any man living who will try to convince me that Jesus said that, meaning every word of it? Were I convinced that Jesus said that, meaning every word of it, I should have to close my New Testament and go out into the darkness. No! He never said that, meaning it. Once more He was holding up a mirror to the soul of His own Jewish people, and to the soul of their representatives, His own disciples, Jews every man of them. It was as though He were saying: "You see how these principles of yours work out. It is one thing for a rabbi, sitting in his study, to develop with a horrid intellectual consistency some doctrines about the necessary exclusiveness of God; but it is another matter to apply that doctrine to life, to life with its pathos and its agony. How do you feel just now with this woman crying out for help which I could render—which you know I could render—but which I am forbidden to render if I confine Myself to the people of My own race? And how do you think God feels when a cry like this woman's reaches His ears? Can your theory of God, compelled by some document to confine Himself to the Jews, stand this assault of human weakness? Can you yourselves stand this assault; can you bear this any longer?"'

'And the woman's voice sounded again over the silence and tension of their souls: "Be it so, Sir," she said. "Dogs we are, hungry, beaten dogs; but even dogs, though they may not presume to what is spread for honoured guests upon the table, are still permitted to pick up the crumbs that fall." At which Jesus could no longer restrain Himself. He had kept up His self-appointed pose, as Joseph did for a little while before his brethren, but at last outpoured His heart. It was as though He had said, who never needed to ask forgiveness from any one: "Woman, forgive Me. O woman, great is your faith! Be it done to you as you desire."'

Rendel Harris.

BY ALEXANDER SOUTER, M.A., D.LITT., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

AMONG British scholars of the present day there is no more striking personality than Dr. Rendel Harris. We are at once impressed by the spare physique, and the clear eyes so often lit up by flashes of humour or of enthusiasm. Then there is the kindly gaiety of the man which puts us at once on friendly terms with him. When you really get to know something of him and of his achievements, you are most impressed by his many-sidedness. You do not necessarily expect a champion of the Armenians to be a scholar. You do not expect a member of the Society of Friends to be a textual critic. You do not expect an anthropologist to be a President of the Free Church Council. Nor do you expect an expert in Oriental languages to be an enthusiast for religious liberty, or a man of the deepest piety, or a skilled detective to get on the track of the *Mayflower's* timbers. Yet he is all of these and more besides. Truly, he is the most astonishing among our scholars by his very diversity of interests, and it is no easy task merely to sketch his career and achievements.

James Rendel Harris is an English Quaker, a native of Plymouth. From the grammar school there he passed to Clare College, Cambridge, doubtless with an entrance mathematical scholarship; for we find that he ended his course as third wrangler in 1874, a year when there were forty-nine of them. In Cambridge, which worships its own examinations, such a man could not escape a fellowship of his college. But he was not merely a distinguished mathematician. Possessed of an interest in Biblical problems, he approached Dr. Hort for advice, and the young enthusiast met with respectful treatment at the hands of the greatest of all Cambridge New Testament scholars. In 1880 and 1881 he was examining for the mathematical tripos. Then he crossed the Atlantic and spent ten years in the United States, first as Professor at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and afterwards at Haverford College. It was during that period, what we may call his mathematical period, that he began to publish. His first work was *The Teaching of the Apostles and*

the Sibylline Books (1885). He returned to Cambridge in 1893 as Lecturer in Palæography, a position which he held for ten years. For one year he was Professor of Theology in the University of Leiden, and about the same time he was appointed (first) Director of Studies at the Friends' Settlement for Social and Religious Study, Woodbrooke, near Birmingham. There he did most to create what is little short of a sublunary paradise for the scholar, minister, missionary, or social worker. In 1918 he was appointed Curator of MSS. at the John Rylands Library, Manchester, where he is to be found daily in a well-lit oak-wainscoted study, surrounded by treasures printed and manuscript.

Dr. Harris' travels have had a most important bearing on his studies. The Near East has been the theatre of his operations. How many visits he has paid to Turkey in Asia, to Egypt, and beyond, I do not know. My first encounter with him was soon after his return to Cambridge, about 1896 I think, when he gave an impassioned and fascinating lecture to the Cambridge University Nonconformist Union on the Armenian massacre that had recently taken place. He had been out on relief work to Urfa; of his experiences his *Letters from Armenia* (1897) are a permanent record. His transparent goodwill and active Christian benevolence are a quick passport to the hearts of these peoples. While working for their good, he has simultaneously been on the look out for manuscripts of Christian literature, and has many very interesting and important discoveries to his credit.

His publications, which number over fifty, are mainly concerned with the textual criticism of the Bible and kindred works. His *Study of Codex Bezae* (1890) is a most suggestive work, one of the few parts of the admirable series 'Cambridge Texts and Studies' that have long been out of print. About the same time he bore an honourable part in the discovery of the *Apology of Aristides*, and a year or two later was co-editor of the famous Sinaitic (or Lewis) Syriac palimpsest of the Gospels. But of all his works I have little

doubt that *The Odes of Solomon* will stand out as the most important. In a small and rather shabby Syriac MS. which he had purchased long before, and then laid aside, he found and gave to the world in 1910 one of the most valuable monuments of the spiritual life of the early Church. In the definitive edition, in two superb quarto volumes, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, re-edited for the Governors of the John Rylands Library, by Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana (Manchester: at the University Press, 1916-1920), we are provided *inter alia* with a bibliography of over nine pages, showing how widespread an interest has been created by this discovery. Honorary degrees have been showered upon him, and, if rumour speaks true, more are to come.

Much of his recent work, *The Dioscuri in*

Christian Legend, The Cult of the Heavenly Twins, Origin of the Cult of Dionysos, Origin of the Cult of Apollo, Origin of the Cult of Artemis, Origin of the Cult of Aphrodite, Origin of Apple Cults, take one into regions where I at least am not able to follow him. But over all his work is seen the same profundity of recondite learning, the same fertility of imagination, the same attractiveness of presentation.

Yet the real man is greater than all his works. His secret is to be found, if at all, in other works, *Memoranda Sacra* (1892), *Union with God* (1895), *The Guiding Hand of God* (1905), *The Sufferings and the Glory* (1914). May this servant of God be long preserved among us to show that learning and piety can dwell together outside the priesthood of any church!

On the Laws of Growth in the Ministry.

AN ADDRESS TO MINISTERS.

BY PRINCIPAL E. GRIFFITH-JONES, D.D., THE UNITED COLLEGE, BRADFORD.

HORACE BUSHNELL, in his fine address on *Pulpit Talent*, gives an account of eight or ten qualities in a man which are necessary for the attainment of eminence in the ministry of Jesus Christ. Among these there is one which he calls the Growth-Talent, or the Talent for Improvability. He says what is very true, that there are men who never grow after they leave college. They grew up to a certain point, and there was an end of it. At school they excelled, and gave the highest promise in their first effort at preaching. But they were soon at their limit, and this limit they will never pass. They seem to have all the talents, and have them in full order, but somehow 'the law of increment' is wanting. Their capital is good enough, but it is invested so as to gather no per cent. of interest money; it is not cumulative. There is, he says, another kind of souls that mature more slowly and under a different law. 'Increment is their destiny. Their force makes force. What they gather seems to enlarge their very brain. Nobody thought of them at first as having much promise. Their faculty was thin and slow. They were put down as among the mediocrities. But while the other class are flagstaves only, these are

trees, going to create themselves like trees by a kind of predestined increment. By and by they are seen to move. Somebody finally speaks of them. Their sentiments are growing bigger, their opinions are getting weight, ideas are breaking in and imaginations are breaking out, and the internal style of their souls, thus lifted, lifts the style of their expression. . . . And finally the wonderful thing about them is that they keep on growing, confounding all expectation, getting all the while more richness and breadth, and covering in all their life, even to its close, with a certain evergreen freshness that is admirable and beautiful to behold.'

We can all supply from our observation instances of this great and beautiful law of Soul-growth. There are some signal instances among this company to-day. Looking back at our college days, we can all remember cases of men who were expected in those far-off days to do wonderful things in life. But they have not done so. Instead of fulfilling expectation, they have gone backward rather than forward. There are other instances of men who were not suspected in those days of concealing hidden talents beneath

their very modest countenances, who have gradually moved to the front, and who now hold a high place in the world of scholarship, thought, or pulpit power. They have shown this instinct or talent for *growth*, and they are where they are, and are doing what they are doing, in virtue of it.

I would not have ventured to bring this matter before you but for one aspect of Bushnell's treatment of the question from which I cordially disagree, and which by rousing a sense of strong antagonism in me has set me thinking on lines that have made me feel, there is a matter that can be usefully handled here to-day. For Bushnell seems to imagine that this talent of growth is not only congenital—which every talent of course is to a large extent—but that it acts in an automatic way beyond the control of its possessor; in other words, that it is a fixed quantity, that one man has it and another has it not, and that there the matter ends. He likens it to an egg which grows briskly in a free state, but 'enlarges never by a line after it has found maturity in a shell.' I venture to think, on the other hand, that the talent of growth is one that, like every other, can be improved; and that the question whether a man shall grow at all, and the rate at which he may grow, and the limits of his growth, are very largely under his own control. We cannot all grow at the same rate, but we can all go on growing; we cannot all attain the same stature, but we can reach our own, which surely is never attained till long after our college days are ended, and which I would like to think need never be reached in this world. For though a man cannot by taking thought add a cubit to his physical height, he surely can do so mentally and spiritually, for in those kingdoms of grace, that stature is not a fixed point but an elastic limit,—'a flying point of bliss remote.'

The important thing is, What are the laws of this soul-growth in pulpit talent? Are they ascertainable? And if they are, what are they? Let me make a bold venture, and endeavour to suggest a few points for your consideration.

I.

I am quite sure of my first. It is the law of *hearty and unremitting industry*. The man who works, in the ministry, and works in the right way, will grow in knowledge, in efficiency, in power, and in influence all his days. About this there

can surely be no doubt whatever. And conversely, the penalty of the ministerial idler is that his soul will slowly but surely atrophy and shrivel up within him. As I find in my Emerson, 'He that will not learn in the great school of life, let him creep into his grave,—the game is not worth the candle.'

I am very much afraid that there is a somewhat widespread idea abroad among our people that many of our ministers do not work hard enough, that a good deal of their time is frittered away in a mysterious manner that shows no results. For all I know this charge may in most cases be an ignorant and somewhat ill-natured libel. But I will venture very heartily to affirm that if it is true of any one of us that after leaving college we cease to carry on the habit of earnest and concentrated study, then we do so at the peril of losing our law of increment. This is, as we all know, a very easy thing to do. There is, for instance, 'no time sheet for parsons,' as a layman said to me a little while ago; and the man who has to work without a time sheet must either draw one up, and make his conscience his time-keeper, or he will fall into lax and indolent ways,—with the inevitable result. Unfortunately, there is for the man who is indolent and who is devoid of a vigorous intellectual conscience, plenty of stuff for pulpit use that can be used with apparent impunity. I say apparent, because there is no real impunity for a pulpit plagiarist. Such a man becomes a mere mental parasite, living on the produce of other minds more vital than his own, and, like all parasites, losing one by one those organs and faculties which are the furniture of the soul, till he becomes like the *sacculina*, a mere characterless bag for intake and expulsion of what ought to be nutriment, but which becomes mere sewage and offal. The only talent which such a preacher is likely to develop is the talent of a mean dexterity in concealing his parasitism under a cloak of apparent erudition. Even this does not avail for long; the plagiarist is sure to be found out sooner or later. People will soon feel a strange lack of meaning and power in his utterances, however specious their eloquence; and he is liable at any moment to be found out consciously by some one in his audience, who suddenly identifies his sources, and then the end is not far. Assuredly, the preacher's first law of growth is this,—that he *should think his own thoughts*, and *make his own sermons*. Once our people realize that what we preach is our own stuff—ore drawn from

many mines it may be, but smelted in the furnace of our own meditation, and beaten on the anvil of our own earnest industry,—they will begin to listen with a new eagerness; while we ourselves will find as we grow older that the work becomes not only easier, and that subjects throng upon us, but that our power of handling them effectively will increase, and that each year will add something to our stature and influence as preachers and thinkers.

II.

The second law of growth in pulpit power is to *live habitually with the great master-minds of our race*, and to wrestle with their works as our daily exercise.

There are, as we all know, thinkers who make us think, and there are others who do our thinking for us. It is of the utmost importance for those whose business is to lead others into fruitful ways of thinking and doing to distinguish between these,—and to cleave to the first as we cleave to life itself. They are the only writers that should find a place on the preacher's library, or at least they should occupy the leading and most frequented shelves. They are not the same writers for all, and they are not the same for any of us at all periods of our thinking lives. But we know that some of the world's mighty minds make us incandescent; they rouse, impel, suggest, drive us into fresh fields, fill us with the quickening process of thought for ourselves, and make the task of preaching a joy and a relief instead of a matter of labour and sorrow, and a much beating of the air. It should be a part of our work at college to find out who *for us* are the men who do this, and it should be the first task of our ministry as students to make ourselves thoroughly acquainted with their books, and to work out for ourselves the leading lines of thought which they suggest. How can a man stagnate, be he in the distracting city or in the paralysing village, if he keeps in touch with the aristocracy of the world of thought, and holds daily converse with one or more of the world's elect souls? He will grow as his interest in them grows; he will catch something of their greatness of manner, something of the distinction of their thought, something of the glory of their style; the so-called limits of his mind will gradually expand, and he too will be a modest member of the company of the immortals. To quote Emerson

once more: 'I do not travel to find comfortable, rich and hospitable people, or clear sky, or ingots that cost too much. But if there were a magnet that would point to the countries and houses where are the persons that are intrinsically rich and powerful, I would sell all I have, and put myself on the road to-morrow. . . . We are as elastic as the gas of gunpowder, and a sentence in a book, and a word dropped in conversation sets free our fancy, and instantly our heads are bathed in galaxies, and our feet tread the floor of the pit,'—and then he adds suggestively,—'and we are entitled to these enlargements, and having once passed our bounds, shall never again be quite the miserable pedants we were' (Essay on 'The Uses of Great Men').

III.

I venture next to mention another law of growth and expansion for preachers which may seem to some to be a little out of the way, but I have the utmost confidence that it is an invaluable one, and a feasible one for all. I mean that *every one of us should have*, alongside of one's professional line of study, *some side-line of study of one's very own* which demands the exercise of the faculty of investigation, or speculation, or inquiry. I hold that every preacher should be an expert in some branch of learning. He should have what the Germans call a *Nebenfach*, or secondary line of work, with a view to keeping his mind fresh and vigorous,—which, in a word, shall keep him from becoming a mere routine thinker. I am not referring to mere literary hobbies, but some broad fruitful line of study—philosophical, literary, scientific, historical, or what-not—where the art of original research and the gift of independent thinking are called into request and given constant exercise. And, further, this *Nebenfach* should be in the line of the great moving currents of thought. There are preachers who are authorities on such matters as Egyptian scarabs, or Assyrian shards, or antediluvian pottery, and it does them no harm to burrow thus among the tombs of the past. Yet I think that those whose business is to lead men in the living present should direct their minds to those problems and subjects and outlooks of thought whose issues lie rather in the future than in the past. If I may make a personal reference here, I should like to say that very early in my ministry I gave myself to investigate what was then an almost unexplored

region,—the relations between the great Theory of Evolution and Religious Thought,—and I should like to testify to the immense benefit to myself and my ministry of the discipline and hard work this involved. It has drawn a silken thread of interest through the reading and meditation of a quarter of a century of very hard work; it has brought into the thoughts of every day a sense of plot-interest of its own, and it has enabled me to accumulate an immense capital of notes and comments on life itself which has made my work as a preacher a daily delight and joy. This is only one line of thought out of scores of others that might be mentioned as equally useful and fascinating, which would make even the loneliest country pastorate full of abiding interest and stimulus.

IV.

There are one or two more laws of growth that remain to be considered which indeed are more important than any yet mentioned.

What we have so far been dealing with are laws or instruments of growth which are individual and solitary, and they may easily become snares if followed out exclusively. It will not do for us preachers to soar too high, till we are out of touch with mother earth. Mere book learning will never make us great men, nor will even the company of the immortals quicken our growing faculty to its fullness. Another means of *becoming eminent as preachers is to make ourselves one with our people*, not in a weak and trivial way, but by identifying ourselves thoroughly with their spiritual interests, individually as well as in the mass. I am persuaded that most preachers who have any gift of reading and thought in them are prone to despise the drudgery, as it is called, of the pastoral office, and isolate themselves too much in their studies. By so doing they are in peril of losing the very thing that they pride themselves most upon—their freshness of mind. What can be more educative and stimulating to a man who has spent four solid hours of the morning in his study wrestling with the abstract problems of life and thought—and none of us ought to spend less than four hours of conscientious study a day—than to leave these airy abstractions and spend the rest of his day among his people, studying *them*, considering *their* problems, getting to know *their* thoughts, noting *their* idiosyncrasies, and taking a humorous, but always loving, glance at their

oddities? Surely there is nothing more full of stimulus than these exercises of one's faculty of observation on the concrete stuff of human nature, and there is nothing that supplies more grist to the preacher's mill than a thoroughly sympathetic study of one's particular congregation. The pastoral office has its sore trials, and its serious troubles; what I am concerned with is pointing out that it is one of the necessary elements in the training of the preacher, and one of the conditions of his mental and spiritual expansion, that he should be in constant touch with as many of the individual members of his church as he can reach without neglecting his other duties. I am sure I am giving the experience of all of you who have done your part as pastors, that, as the years go by, you realize that what you gain through contact with your people is greater, and it may even be of finer quality, than what you have been able to give them. The channels of a man's sympathies are not only broadened but enriched by the contribution of his people's friendship and trust. For if a man's mind is fed by thought, his heart is fed by sympathy. There is a wonderfully quickening and impelling power in this spiritual contact with average struggling men and women, whose silent heroism is entangled so inextricably with their commonplace and meaner qualities. Life, after all (of which the noblest thought is but the shadow or mirror), is the great educator; and we ministers must see to it that we do not foolishly despise the school of homely experience, and the rewarding intercourse of ordinary minds.

V.

And now for the last, and if I had the grace needful, it would be a *best* word. The final condition and law of growth as preachers of the word is *to cultivate the law of retirement, the law of fellowship with the Unseen; the law of meditation and prayer*. It might seem to an outsider a strange thing to hear one preacher urge his brethren not to forget the call to devotion and quiet musing as a daily duty; yet we who are in the circle of knowledge know well how easy it is to be a keeper of other men's vineyards, and yet to neglect one's own! Paradoxical as it may seem, I fear that if there is one danger to which we are practically liable more than another, it is to forget the habit of personal piety. It is the preacher's business and profession to pray constantly for and

often with others ; he is perpetually thinking of and for them, and urging them to the performance of this and that neglected duty. And just as it is his temptation to forget the offertory while always urging others to give, he is prone to forget to pray for himself,—so busy is he praying for others. And so he is apt to fall into fits of *accidie* and despondency and barrenness of which he is heartily ashamed, but whose cause is not far to seek. I am not without my fears that it is this curse of professionalism—this tendency to handle the high things of the spirit as a matter of routine,—this materialization of the ethereal elements of the soul-life, that accounts for the ossification of so many preachers' powers before they reach middle age, and for the fact that by the time they have attained to life's meridian they have lost most of the stimulating and inspiring gifts they once had in the more vital years of youth.

There is no more prime duty, no more imperative need of us who are preachers of the holy Word of God, than to keep the fire burning brightly in the inner shrine of our own spirits. Those who do so will in time have faces that shine with a radiance that comes from within ; their spirits will ripen instead of hardening with the lapse of years ; they will grow in grace and in the knowledge of their heavenly Lord ; and they will be able to lead others with an ever-deepening trust and love to the throne of the heavenly grace. There are some old ministers whom it is a privilege and a delight to hear in prayer, for as we listen we feel that Heaven is very near these Beulah pilgrims, and that there is but a step between us and seeing the Invisible itself. Here is an ideal which it should be the utmost endeavour of every minister to attain.

Literature.

PRINCIPAL IVERACH.

THE volume entitled *The Christian Message*, which Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published (7s. 6d. net), is an appropriate appendix to the article on Principal James Iverach which was contributed to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES last month. For it contains the lectures delivered by Dr. Iverach to the students of the United Free College in Aberdeen at the close (and occasionally at the opening) of each session since 1905.

The variety is very great. It ranges from an exegesis of the phrase 'into my name' to an exposition of the Hegelian theory of the State. And the lecturer is just as much at home with Hegel as with the grammar of New Testament Greek.

The earlier lectures are occupied with the work of the ministry. They are the ripe fruit of a successful pastorate, a sympathetic recognition of the variety of pastors and pastorates, and a healthy, humorous humanity. Dr. Iverach commends wise adaptation : 'But then there are south and north, east and west, and for each we shall have to make a particular study. More particularly we shall have to study the local conditions of the place if we are to know our people. Are we to work in Aberdeen, then it would be well to know the im-

portance of the twelve-mile limit, and the characteristics of those who dwell within it.' One can see the smile on the faces of the students as they remembered the popular saying, 'Tak' awa' Aiberdeen and twal mile roun', and faur are ye ?'

THE BIBLE AND SOCIAL LIFE.

Professor Charles Ryder Smith, D.D., has been fortunate in the choice of his subject. He chose it originally as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of London. He made good the choice, both in obtaining the degree and in issuing this handsome volume. The title is *The Bible Doctrine of Society in its Historical Evolution* (T. & T. Clark ; 18s.).

He has been fortunate, we say. It is society that is the theme of the most popular writing at the present time, and perhaps also of the most powerful thinking. It is in some form of social salvation that anxious reformers are seeking a solution of the world's unrest. And the most deeply felt need of all is a basis—a clear basis in Scripture—for the belief that God means to save society, and that the salvation is to be found in our Lord Jesus Christ. That basis Dr. Ryder Smith has provided. That is the meaning of his book.

He works his subject after the historical method. And one result is to bring into positively startling prominence a break which Jesus made with the thought of His time. The Old Testament religion is a national religion. The individual, even in respect of immortality, was forgotten in the nation. By the time of the Herods the national religion had become a caste religion. A man was saved (if a man's salvation was thought of) because he was a son of Abraham, and even, practically, only if he was a son of the Law. Jesus gave Himself to the individual. It is true, He began with the preaching of the Kingdom of God, and the establishment of the Kingdom as the consummation was His aim throughout. But He was most emphatic that the Kingdom could come, not by the conversion of the mass, but of the individual. Even when (to quote Dr. Ryder Smith) 'in the Feeding of the Five Thousand Jesus wrought that rare thing, a miracle for a multitude, He at once took great pains to avoid allegiance *en masse*. Here, too, lay the ground of His custom of flight from the too active interest of crowds. It would have been easy for Him at any time to head the Jewish "masses" against Rome—how easy, Caiaphas and his associates well knew, but He deliberately and consistently refused the rôle of a popular "Messiah." On the contrary, He carefully gathered His disciples one by one.' Dr. Ryder Smith gives a most remarkable list of passages which are words of Christ addressed to or spoken of individuals, and then he says: 'The series could easily be extended, but the passages quoted are characteristic of all parts of the New Testament and suffice to show that the liberty and responsibility of the individual were a uniform postulate of early Christian thought. Without this the Gospel would have no meaning at all. The New Testament everywhere assumes that each man's choice is decisive of his own fate. Not the nation, nor the caste, nor even the Church or the family, is the basis of the ultimate Christian society, but the single man.'

Then follow some impressive sentences describing the Ideal Individual—the individual as he ought to be and has the offer of becoming, according to the teaching of the New Testament. These sentences will be found 'In the Study.'

But the ideal individual belongs to the ideal society. And three sections follow describing that society. It is known as the Kingdom of God; it

is spoken of as 'in Christ'; it is in possession of the Spirit of God.

Then comes another important thought which deserves the prominence Dr. Ryder Smith gives it. It is the fact 'that none of the three New Testament accounts of the perfect society immediately links men with one another. The direct connexion of each man is with Christ, and only through Him with other men. There are, indeed, many direct social bonds between men now, but that is because their present relations are imperfect; these bonds will disappear or merge in a higher relation "when that which is perfect is come." In the New Testament Jesus is no titular patron of a society whose true link must be sought elsewhere; the Bible nowhere names a "common spirit of humanity," or a "common conscience," or a "human *ethos*"; in it mankind is one in God. He is the focus that gives the curve its line. He is the sun that unites the rays. So the characteristic act of the final society is worship.'

The book is a triumphant answer to the charge that the critical and historical study of the Bible is useless for the purposes of devotion.

LIFU AND UVEA.

Lifu and Uvea—they are as unknown as Teschen to the Prime Minister before the Peace Conference. Twenty-five years ago Mrs. Emma Hadfield and her husband landed at Lifu; twenty-five trying but interesting years they have spent there or on the neighbouring island of Uvea, preaching and living the gospel of the grace of God. And all the while Mrs. Hadfield has been taking notes. She found one delightful native couple. They knew the folklore and believed it, and as soon as they knew her they began to relate it. She has thus been able to rescue from oblivion many a curious tale. She has told these tales now in a fine illustrated volume entitled *Among the Natives of the Loyalty Group* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net). And she has told much besides.

'Lifu is the largest of a number of islands called the Loyalty Group. It is about fifty miles long and twenty-five miles broad. It is of coral formation, and, judging from the appearance of the rocks along the coast (hungit), it would seem to have been raised to its present elevation by three or four upheavals. It is so scantily covered with a light red soil that it would be almost impossible

to find a square acre of land on which a plough might be used. There is often good, rich soil in the deep holes among the rocks and stones, which the natives utilise for growing the gigantic taro, banana, and yams.'

The island of Uvea 'is very beautiful; the late Captain Turpie, of the London Missionary Society's barque the "John Williams," has been heard to say that Uvea was the prettiest island in the South Seas; and as one sails up the lagoon, all alive with fish, studded on the one hand by numerous small islands and on the other by miles and miles of glittering white sand, backed by dark groves of palm trees, one might almost imagine he was nearing the shores of Arcadia.'

It is a story of progress. But the progress has not been all along the line. 'It may truly be said that, with the advent of civilisation, the natives have in some respects greatly degenerated. The white man's vices have been found much more attractive to many of them than his virtues. Although cannibalism, polygamy, terrorism and tribal wars have disappeared, the white man's demon "drink" —to name only one of his vices—would have proved more ruinous, morally and physically, than all these combined, had it not been checked by the restraining hand of religion and education. Whenever a native of these islands drinks—and it is said they all take to drink as to mother's milk—his one sole and undisguised object is to become intoxicated as speedily as possible.'

Mrs. Hadfield describes the native customs admirably. There is no lack of understanding; there is no hurry to find a moral.

ANIMATE NATURE.

Some notes have already been written on Professor J. Arthur Thomson's Gifford Lectures entitled *The System of Animate Nature* (Williams & Norgate; 2 vols., 30s. net). And from these Notes some idea may have been gained of their interest and value. It will now be enough to say that though Professor Thomson has written much, and always well, he has never written anything better or anything likely to last longer than this book. Its theme is the highest possible for a student of science, and he has risen to the height of it. The interest grows steadily. We do not remember having read a book which began so quietly and ended so rapturously.

Let it be understood further that this book is a great reconciliation. We have persisted in believing that science as well as philosophy was on the side of God. The greatest teachers in our land have in recent Gifford and other lectures left us in no doubt about philosophy. Professor Arthur Thomson is already recognized as a prince among the teachers of science, and this work of his may henceforth be quoted with confidence for the scientific attitude. No formal, or informal, attempt is made to reconcile science and religion. We see what science is, we see what it points to beyond itself, and that is enough. Nor is the reconciliation merely in appearance. We are not shown science occupying one area and religion another—looking at one another over the wall of contiguous gardens. We see religion beginning with science; we see science incomplete without religion. The 'middle wall of partition' has been removed as utterly as was that wall which once separated Jew from Gentile, and with not less benefit to mankind.

CARLYLE AND RUSKIN.

A book on Carlyle and a book on Ruskin have been issued together from the same Publishing House and we shall take them together here. The one is a *Guide to Carlyle*, by Mr. Augustus Ralli (Allen & Unwin; 2 vols., 42s. net). The other is a volume of Centenary Studies in Ruskin, edited by Mr. J. Howard Whitehouse, and entitled *Ruskin the Prophet* (8s. 6d. net).

We may take the two books together the more readily that in one of the Ruskin essays the Dean of St. Paul's makes a comparison, as frank and as felicitous as he knows how, between the ideals of life held by Carlyle and Ruskin. Before coming to Dean Inge, however, let us note that Mr. Ralli has great faith in the future of Carlyle. Why his fame is eclipsed at present is due, he believes, to accidental circumstances—Froude's incompetence (or malevolence) and the War—and these bad influences will pass. As for the War, it has been asserted with much confidence that Carlyle was a pro-German, which is true; and that he was in favour of the use of force (right or wrong, if it is strength), which is not true. He denied it; Froude, his biographer, says he was entitled to deny it; and Paul, the biographer of Froude, says that Froude was entitled to say that Carlyle was entitled to deny it. Mr. Ralli goes through all Carlyle's

works; giving an account of them and of their contents; and his hope is that thereby many of this generation may be led to see that Carlyle is no spent force, but is full of ideas which are of undying worth.

The essays on Ruskin are of various merit, but not one of them is without its significance. The most interesting to a well-furnished student of Ruskin is due to the editor himself. It is an account of Ruskin's friendship with William Macdonald Macdonald, the laird of Crossmount (between Lochs Rannoch and Tummel). Six letters from Ruskin to Macdonald (none of them appearing in the Library edition of Ruskin's works) are given, and they are right well worth reading.

But now to the Dean. A few sentences must be quoted: 'Ruskin avowed himself to be a disciple of Carlyle, and it is plain that the two men were engaged upon the same crusade. Carlyle's thought was determined by the reaction against many of the "ideas of 1789," as displayed in their results during the revolutionary period. He hated its scepticism, its negations, its love of sonorous phrases and claptrap, its materialism, its atheism, and perhaps above all its anarchism. Like many others of his generation, he wished to return to idealism, to personal religion, and to a well-ordered organization of society. He and Ruskin both wrote with the violence of major prophets: this was a characteristic of the age. Swinburne, Hugo and Morris were also angry and vehement writers. But Carlyle was, what Ruskin was not, a Puritan. He was not (as Sir Henry Taylor called him) "a Puritan who has lost his creed"; Carlyle never lost the Puritan creed; he was a Puritan without the dogmas of his sect. The creed of Puritanism is the creed of Stoicism; and there is something in this type of mind which turns its creed into a war-cry.'

Again: 'Carlyle is often accused of teaching that Might is Right; he really held that Right is Might, if we take long views. It is not altogether true; for spiritual forces prevail in their own field, which is not that of external and palpable success. We must neither revive the Deuteronomic creed that righteousness leads to outward prosperity, nor fall victims to the snobbishness of historians who judge, after the event, that every apparently lost cause is the wrong cause. But there is a sense in which "the history of the world is the judgment of the world"; and this is what Carlyle, in all his historical writings, means to assert.'

And again (but here we have Inge not less than Carlyle and Ruskin): 'He and Ruskin were both intellectual aristocrats, and heartily despised ballot-box democracy, a fetish which now, after a century of fatuous laudation, stands very insecurely on its pedestal. He was fairly convinced that in spite of the complacent trumpetings of Macaulay and the commercial school, civilization had taken a wrong and ultimately disastrous turn. He loved the simple peasant life in which he had been brought up, and had his full share of personal pride, the pride of the independent and poor man. Ruskin was much nearer to Carlyle than to Rossetti, in whom he could find no over-mastering purpose and no social conscience, as Carlyle could find none in Coleridge. The prophet in him condemned the purely artistic temperament of his friend.'

THE 'MAYFLOWER.'

The tercentenary celebration of the sailing of the *Mayflower* has been a great event. It has moved the whole English-speaking world to admiration. It has touched some parts of that world to repentance. Did not Canon E. W. Barnes 'do penance' (as the Editor of *Public Opinion* put it) in Westminster Abbey? Did he not say: 'In holding such a service we acknowledge that the persecution of the Puritans by the early Stuarts was wrong; that the post-reformation intolerance of statesmen and clergy was wrong. We affirm our conviction that complete religious toleration is a wise principle of statesmanship'?'¹

And yet it is not some American citizen, proud of his physical ancestry, who has done most for that victory of righteousness, it is a great English scholar, prouder far of the spiritual ancestry. Dr. Rendel Harris has traced the history of the *Mayflower* industriously and has written affectionately of it. He has written book after book and encouraged others to write; and every book has been illustrated under his direction. Here are five volumes all sent out at once, and all published by Messrs. Longmans for the Manchester University Press—*The Finding of the 'Mayflower,'* a substantial volume (4s. 6d. net), and four *Souvenirs of the 'Mayflower' Tercentenary* (from 1s. to 6d. net).

¹ *Public Opinion*, 24th September 1920, p. 299.

INDIAN WOMEN.

Messrs. Simpkin have published a handsome volume on *Women of India*. The author is Otto Rothfeld, F.R.G.S., I.C.S.

Mr. Rothfeld understands India. With the women of India he is in sympathy. He speaks the truth, but he speaks it in love. When he is describing the Indian mother he does not deny that 'she is lavish with her caresses and endearments, as in other moods she may fly into fits of uncontrolled anger. But, except for the lengthy period of nursing, sometimes three and ordinarily two years, to which she is willing to devote herself, she shows only too little of that continuous and intelligent care which is expected from a mother.' But, he hastens to add, it is largely due to ignorance. 'She has not—one might with justice say she is not allowed to have—the knowledge which is needed to be a good mother. She is unaware of the most elementary requirements of sanitation and health. Worse still, she has not been trained to know the importance of compelling good habits and regular discipline in early childhood.'

But it is when he speaks of the dancing girl that his sympathy has its opportunity. 'For the women of India, it may almost be said, there is only one independent profession open, one that is immemorial, remunerative, even honoured, and that is the profession of the dancing girl. There is hardly a town in India, however small, which has not its group of dancing girls, dubious perhaps and mediocre; and there is not a wedding, hardly an entertainment of any circumstance, at which the dancing girl's services are not engaged. And it may be added that there is hardly a class so much misjudged or a profession so much misunderstood.' 'In the romantic fancies of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, she was, both in France and Germany, a personage on whom poets lavished the embellishments of their art. Her hazy outlines they bespangled with the imagery of fiction and the phantasies of invention. She was a symbol for oriental opulence, a creature of incredible luxury and uncurbed sensuousness, or tropic passion and jewelled magnificence. From her tresses blew the perfumes of lust; on her lips, like honey sweet, distilled the poisons of vice; hidden in her bodice of gold brocade she carried the dagger with which she killed.'

But 'the very name of dancing girl, it must

be noted, is a misnomer. For as an artist she finds expression primarily in song, not in the dance. In the Indian theory of music, dancing is but an adjunct, one rhythm the more, to the sung melody. It is the singer's voice which is the ultimate means of music, her song which is its real purpose. To embellish its expression and heighten its enjoyment the singer takes the aid of instruments, the pipe, the strings, the drum, and not least of the dance. Regarded in its first elements, the dance is one means the more of marking the time of the melody. Throughout the Indian dance the feet, like the tuned drums, are means to mark the beats. The time is divided into syllables or bars, and the dancer's beating feet, circled with a belt of mingling bells, must move and pause in the strictest accordance. The right foot performs the major part, the left completes the rhythmic syllable. But further by her dance the singer's art is to make more clear and more magnetic the meaning of her song. With her attitudes and gestures she accords her person to her melody and sense, till her whole being, voice and movement, is but one living emotion.'

The volume is illustrated throughout with full-page coloured pictures of Indian women, by M. V. Dhurandhar.

FREEMASONRY.

If Dr. Homes Dudden had seen the book on *The Origin and Evolution of Freemasonry*, by Albert Churchward, M.D., just published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (12s. 6d. net), he would have found there some of that evidence for communication with the dead which he is in search of. Says Dr. Churchward: 'I know two people still living who possess the inestimable gift of seeing and being able to converse or communicate with their friends, who never leave them night or day. But these good spirits cannot talk so that one can hear them; they cannot make noises, nor can you take photographs of them: *all this that Spiritualists tell you is chicanery and humbug* [the italics are Dr. Churchward's own]. You cannot take photographs of spirits because they are composed of pure corpuscles—Beta Rays; and as it is the Beta Ray that produces photographs, naturally it cannot produce itself. If you ask them a question, they will make a motion of affirmation or negation only; but if you have a good spiritual medium, whom you send into a hypnotic state, you can

converse, gain any information you wish that they are permitted to tell you, and they will answer questions or communicate their wishes. The Ancient Egyptian Priests knew this and gained much knowledge through this means. But the real secrets are known to a few only, and since the fall of the Old Egyptian Empire the ignorance of the human always has been such that great opposition has always been, and still is, shown to the study of the Laws of the Spiritual World. But future generations will become more enlightened, and the knowledge that we shall gain through this means may be the source of enlightening us as to *what life is* and all the secrets of the Universe.'

Dr. Churchward is an authority on his subject and writes well. He tells us just as much as it is lawful for him to tell. To know more we must become Freemasons.

KOREA.

'When the Japanese landed in Korea in 1904, the missionaries welcomed them. They knew the tyranny and abuses of the old Government, and believed that the Japanese would help to better things. The ill-treatment of helpless Koreans by Japanese soldiers and coolies caused a considerable reaction of feeling. When, however, Prince Ito became Resident-General the prevailing sentiment was that it would be better for the people to submit and to make the best of existing conditions, in the hope that the harshness and injustice of Japanese rule would pass.'

But it did not pass. Ito was succeeded by Terauchi. Terauchi was antagonistic to Christianity, and soon got into trouble with the missionaries and teachers: 'One of the difficulties was over the direction that children in schools and others should bow before the picture of the Japanese Emperor on feast days. The Japanese tried to maintain to the missionaries that this was only a token of respect; the Christians declared that it was an act of adoration. To the Japanese his Emperor is a divine being, the descendant of the gods.' The head-teacher of one of the schools was awarded seven years' penal servitude for refusing to bow before the Imperial picture.

The whole story of Japanese misrule in Korea is told by Mr. F. A. M'Kenzie in *Korea's Fight for Freedom* (Simpkin; 10s. 6d. net).

ADULT EDUCATION.

Those who were favoured enough to receive a copy of Professor James Stuart's autobiography will be interested readers of a book of essays which has been issued from the Cambridge University Press. For Professor Stuart gave himself to the promotion of adult education with the vigour and persistence for which he was notorious, and in his autobiography he tells with utmost unreserve the story of the movement in its early years. No one can escape the infection of his fervour. And this volume of *Cambridge Essays on Adult Education* (12s. 6d. net), edited by Mr. R. St. John Parry, Vice-Master of Trinity College, carries the story right on from Stuart's autobiography to the present day. The direct history is written by Mr. A. E. Dobbs, sometime Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; and there are essays on special topics by D. H. S. Cranage ('The Purpose and Meaning of Adult Education'), A. E. Mansbridge ('Organisation'), J. Howard B. Masterman ('Democracy and Adult Education'), Arthur Greenwood ('Labour and Adult Education'), Mrs. Huws Davies ('Women and Adult Education'), Alice Thompson ('The University Extension Movement'), W. G. Constable ('The Tutorial Class Movement'); and Alfred Cobham of Southport gives 'A Student's Experience.'

Mr. Cobham shows what the Movement has done, and what it may do again. He frankly confesses that all he has been able to do he owes to it. And he can write.

'Nothing more disastrous has ever befallen this nation than the alienation of moral considerations from economic theory. The assumption that self-interest is the prime motive of human action has been a greater curse to England than all the ten plagues were to Egypt. Its results are seen alike in the East end and in the West. It has sullied the beauty of our country and poisoned the English soul, and its maxims may be read in the hard, sullen countenances of its votaries. "Buy in the cheapest market; sell in the dearest"; "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." These, and such as these, make up the decalogue of the infamous code of "commercial morality." Self-sacrifice, not self-interest, must be the keynote of the reconstructed world. This is the example and the legacy of the dead heroes in Flanders. Their names, cut deep

in the granite memorials in the Town Hall squares of the cities and towns of England, will ever give the lie direct to the economic heresies, which have been drummed and trumpeted into the unthinking heads of the people for a century and a quarter.'

UNKNOWN CHINA.

In Unknown China (Seeley; 25s. net) is a record of the observations, adventures, and experiences of a pioneer missionary during a prolonged sojourn amongst the wild and unknown Nosu Tribe of Western China.

The pioneer missionary is Mr. S. Pollard, the author already of several lively books on China. This volume is as light-hearted as any of them. For Mr. Pollard's great aim is to carry sunshine into the unknown parts of China—the sunshine of the Gospel—and he knows no better way than to carry himself there, with his dauntless courage and smiling face. And he has the gift of writing. He writes as he is—cheerfully, fearlessly, humorously. Here is a scene:

'There was an inner circle of about a dozen of us around the fire, and a second still more numerous circle standing at our backs, deeply interested in all that was going on. We were joined soon by the widowed eldest daughter of Ah-pooh, who had come across to see the guests. She was the mother of three sons, and was gorgeously dressed. There is no doubt about these Nosu ladies knowing how to dress. From each ear she had more than a dozen silver chains hanging down, and, to my great surprise, a silver brooch fastened the front of her long jacket. All the women wear these brooches. Those of the servants are of brass, and those of the mistresses of silver. If I had only had a gold brooch to present to this widowed lady I think I could have won her respect for ever.

'But while one admired the gorgeous dress and the silver ear-rings and the brooch and the massive roll of cloth that crowned the head, there was one thing about the lady that one did not quite relish. She was smoking, and evidently was very fond of her five-foot-long pipe. A five-foot-long pipe in the pretty mouth of a beautifully dressed, handsome woman was a shocker. We associate ladies smoking at home with a delicate cigarette and graceful, curling wreaths of white vapour. But here they have left the initial stages behind long

ago, and use a pipe five feet long. The mother was also smoking a pipe, but hers was only four feet long. Several of the men were smoking short pipes with a wide bowl, similar to the pipes used in England and such as are never seen in China, where the bowl is usually a tiny one, able to contain only a pinch of the shaved tobacco.'

The 'Unknown China' into which Mr. Pollard penetrated at the risk of his life, and in which he lived at the risk of being made the Chief of all the Chiefs in it, was the upper reaches of the Yangtse. Although it is China, the people are not Chinese. Mr. Pollard divides the tribes of Western China into three races, the Nosu, the Miao, and the Shan. He lived among the Nosu. Their language is more nearly akin to Japanese than to Chinese. 'This fact may strengthen the very reasonable idea held by some, that the Japanese race originally came from the east coast of China, where centuries ago the Miao races predominated.' Among these tribes 'there are no Buddhist temples, no debasing Temples of Hades casting a gloom over the thought of all the people, no women with deformed feet, no infanticide of unwelcome baby girls, no overpowering mandarins with their retinue of unscrupulous squeezing underlings. We were in a new country as different from the province of Yunnan as Norway is from Russia or the highlands of Scotland are from the Black Country.'

WITCHES.

'At first the Church refused its sanction to the popular tales about witches, more especially to the tale of the Sabbath and the transportation of witches through the air, often over immense distances. The canonists, Ivo of Chartres and Gratian, dismiss this as a fiction: which to believe is pagan, an error in the faith—in short heresy. But popular credence triumphed over the canonists. The reports of the activities of witches became so numerous, so determined and so circumstantial that it was wellnigh impossible to disbelieve. It became simply a question of how to reconcile well-authenticated facts with the canonists. A way out of the dilemma was discovered in the fifteenth century, at a time when the craze had almost reached its height. The witches meant by the canonists must have been a different order of being from those referred to by a later generation

when they spoke of witches. It was merely a matter of nomenclature after all. Those responsible not only for guarding the purity of the faith but also for protecting the faithful from the assaults of the Evil One, as delivered by witches, could no longer allow their freedom of action to be curtailed, the powers of the Devil actually aggrandized by the misinterpreted ruling that belief in witches was error. Accordingly, when a certain eminent lawyer named Ponzinibio dared to maintain the accuracy of the canonists and to assert that all belief in witchcraft and sorcery was a delusion, the master of the Sacred Palace, Bartholomew de Spina, wrote a vehement and momentous reply, in which he turned the vials of a righteous indignation against Ponzinibio and called upon the Inquisition to proceed against the lawyer as himself a fautor of heretics. The attitude of the Church had indeed made a complete reversal. What previously it had been heresy to assert, it now became heresy to deny. The divine law was now discovered clearly to prove the existence of witches, and the Scriptures were reinforced by the civil code. There no longer remained any room for doubt or equivocation.'

The characteristic paragraph—characteristic of the book as well as of the Mediæval Church—is taken from *Mediæval History and the Inquisition*, by A. S. Turberville, M.C., M.A., B.Litt., Lecturer in Modern History in the University College of North Wales (Crosby Lockwood; 10s. 6d. net). It is the book of a historian, as free from prejudice as the writer of history has any business to be. It is the work of a scholarly historian, careful to reach the real source of his materials and as careful to let them make their proper impression. It is the history of a historian with imagination and no little writing ability, who can make even the dry bones of the British Museum rise and stand upon their feet.

WILFRED GRENFELL.

Autobiography is having its day. And if it comes in as fresh and human and religious a form as this, long may its day last. This is the autobiography of Wilfred Thomason Grenfell, M.D. (Oxon.), C.M.G. Its title is *A Labrador Doctor* (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net).

Dr. Grenfell does not waste time over his early years. His account of the Public School he

attended, which was Marlborough, and of the medical classes he did not attend ('This was simply a matter of tipping the beadle, who marked you off. I personally attended only two botany lectures during the whole course') is certainly astonishing enough and could have been longer. But he hurries on, first to his work among the deep-sea fishermen, and then to Labrador. Here is a good story, however, in the passing.

'I was lucky enough to work under the famous Sir Andrew Clark, Mr. Gladstone's great physician. He was a Scotchman greatly beloved, and always with a huge following to whom he imparted far more valuable truths than even the medical science of thirty years ago afforded. His constant message, repeated and repeated at the risk of wearying, was: "Gentlemen, you must observe for yourselves. It is your observation and not your memory which counts. It is the patient and not the disease whom you are treating." His was real teaching, and reminds one of the Glasgow professor who, in order to emphasize the same point of the value of observation, prepared a little cupful of kerosene, mustard, and castor oil, and calling the attention of his class to it, dipped a finger into the atrocious compound and then sucked his finger. He then passed the mixture around to the students, who all did the same with most dire results. When the cup returned and he observed the faces of his students, he remarked: "Gentlemen, I am afraid you did not use your powers of obsairvation. The finger that I put into the cup was no the same one that I stuck in my mouth afterwards.'

What an amazing work he has accomplished in Labrador—healing, preaching, educating, rescuing, enriching work. And what adventures he has had in doing it. His account of the night he spent on a small pan of ice along with his dogs, when he had to kill three of them, in order to get their skins to keep him from freezing to death and their legs to form a flagstaff, would make the fortune of a writer of boys' books. One of his earliest struggles was, as so often in this present evil world, with the drink-seller and the drunkard:

'The next summer we had trouble with a form of selfishness which I have always heartily hated—the liquor traffic. Suppose we do allow that a man has a right to degrade his body with swallowing alcohol, he certainly has no more right to lure others to their destruction for money than a filibuster has a right to spend his money in gun-

powder and shoot his fellow-countrymen. To our great chagrin we found that an important neighbour near one of our hospitals was selling intoxicants to the people—girls and men. One girl found drunk on the hillside brought home to me the cost of this man's right to "do as he liked." We promptly declared war, and I thanked God who had made "my hands to war, and my fingers to fight"—when that is the only way to resist the Devil successfully and to hasten the kingdom of peace.'

In another place he says: 'A man does not need alcohol and is far better without it. A man who sees two lights when there is only one is not wanted at the wheel. The people who sell alcohol know that just as well as we do, but for paltry gain they are unpatriotic enough to barter their earthly country as well as their heavenly one, and to be branded with the knowledge that they are cursing men and ruining families. The filibuster deserves the name no less because he does his destructive work secretly and slowly, and wears the emblems of respectability instead of operating in the open with "Long Toms" under the shadow of the "Jolly Roger."'

But the book will be read. These are only samples of its outspokenness, only instances of the work and labour of love which this great man has done and is doing for the Kingdom.

The Yearbook of the Universities of the Empire is issued for the Universities Bureau. It is edited by Mr. W. H. Dawson. The first issue was in 1914. In 1917 it was suspended. Now it comes again, and the present volume covers the three years, 1918-1920 (Bell; 15s. net). It is a complete, compact, accurate, and admirably arranged volume—a conspicuous advance in appearance at any rate on the last issue. It is now that rare book about which a reviewer can find nothing in particular to say. After no little time spent, not even a misprint has been discovered. Clearly Mr. Dawson is an expert in proof-reading and a specialist in proper names. Let all those who hitherto have tormented the Registrars about degrees and classes and fees and what not, give these officials a holiday. All that is necessary is to possess this excellent Yearbook, and 'inquire within upon everything.'

Of all the incidents of the War, did anything,

did even the Zeebrugge exploit, exceed in daring and desperate valour the landing from the *River Clyde* at Gallipoli? The story has been told frequently. But it has never been told more truthfully than by Major George Davidson, M.A., M.D. Dr. Davidson was selected for his coolness and unconscious heroism to go in the 'Clyde' and do what he found to his hand to do. He had marvellous escapes and showed marvellous endurance.

'About 8-30 an officer on shore made a dash for our ship, and on describing the terrible condition and suffering of the wounded who had been in the sandbank for about fourteen hours, I decided to go to their assistance. We had previously been officially warned that it would be impossible for any of the Ambulance to land before morning, but heedless of this I set off alone over the barges and splashed through the remaining few yards of water. Here most of those still alive were wounded more or less severely, and I set to work on them, removing many useless and harmful tourniquets for one thing, and worked my way to the left towards the high rocks where the snipers still were. All the wounded on this side I attended to, an officer accompanying me all the time. I then went to the other side, and after seeing to all in the sand my companion left me, and I next went to a long, low rock which projected into the water for about 20 yards a short way to the right of the "Clyde." Here the dead and wounded were heaped together two and three deep, and it was among these I had my hardest work. All had to be disentangled single-handed from their uncomfortable positions, some lying with head and shoulders in the tideless water, with broken legs in some cases dangling on a higher level.'

The story is told in a volume which the historian of the War must not miss, a volume which the reader will greatly enjoy, so well written is it and yet so free from fine writing or any form of heroics. Its title is *The Incomparable 29th and the "River Clyde"* (Aberdeen: Bisset; 6s. net).

Another 'Guild Text-Book' has been published. Its title is *Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel: their Lives and Books* (Black; 1s. net). The author is Dr. W. B. Stevenson, Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages in the University of Glasgow.

To that select series of Oxford books called

'Virgilian Studies' another choice volume, has been added. It is a study by Miss M. M. Crump, M.A., of the stages of composition through which the *Aeneid* passed. The title is *The Growth of the Aeneid* (Blackwell; 6s. net).

It was a flash of pure vision that gave the Rev. T. H. Darlow his title. The title is *Holy Ground* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It brings out harmoniously the note running through the sermons, from the first to the last. It is the note of awe. Not awe that drowns thought but that revives or inspires it. See 'In the Study.'

Dr. John Kelman delivered the Mendenhall Lectures of DePauw University in 1919. They are now published in this country by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. The title is *Some Aspects of International Christianity* (7s. 6d. net). As the title, so the lectures: they deal with the international situation succeeding the War. They deal with Patriotism (for which Dr. Kelman finds a place and a purpose), with the League of Nations (for which he prophesies an ever-growing influence), with the Christian outlook on the foreign mission field (where sagacious statesmanship is needed not less than consecrated life), and with the responsibility that lies on America. His last lecture is a powerful appeal to the United States to recognize God's purpose and to place that purpose above party.

The Rev. Dinsdale T. Young is one of the greatest preachers in Methodism, and that is to say he is one of the greatest preachers in the world. He uses no manuscript. Is it in spite of or because of that circumstance that he is great? He himself says because of. And his hearers agree with him. In Edinburgh he reached the height of his success: 'where, in the old Nicolson Square Church, I was favoured with a romance of manifold prosperity. Immediately the church filled to overflowing alike on Sabbath mornings and evenings. So it remained during my ministry there. I, on several occasions, had the remarkable experience of having more people excluded than could be crowded into the building. In the *Scotsman* (which was and is always most kind in its references to me) a picture appeared representing the policemen guiding and restraining the waiting crowds.'

Mr. Young has recorded his impressions of the men he has met. He speaks of the book as 'Frank Chapters of Autobiography,' but the title he has given it is *Stars of Retrospect* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). He has gathered into his net 'of all kinds' and he has been able to find good in (almost) everything. His great interest has been in preaching and preachers. Politics and politicians he has had no drawing to. He has his political opinions, however. 'I know,' he says, 'how many will dispute my opinion, but my opinion it is, that the "Passive Resistance" Movement was strangely ill-advised. I believe that it will be long before the Free Churches shake off the prejudice which that movement has brought upon them. Hot-headed politicians have done much to give present-day Nonconformity a difficult task in executing its spiritual service.'

Professor Bliss Perry of Harvard is surely an inspiring teacher. Certainly he can write so as to inspire. His new book *A Study of Poetry* (Houghton Mifflin Company; \$2.25) is agreeable reading, and more, it is educative. There is that firmness of touch which betrays the master of his subject, and there is that fertility of illustration which betrays the omnivorous reader.

Of the reading see evidence in this: 'Mr. Lascelles-Abercrombie refers to the "region where the outward radiations of man's nature combine with the irradiations of the world." That is to say, the inward-sweeping stream of consciousness is instantly met by an outward-moving activity of the brain which recognizes relationships between the objects proffered to the senses and the personality itself. The "I" projects itself into these objects, claims them, appropriates them as a part of its own nature. Professor Fairchild, who calls this self-projecting process by the somewhat ambiguous name of "personalizing," rightly insists, I believe, that poets make a more distinctive use of this activity than other men. He quotes some of the classic confidences of poets themselves: Keats's "If a sparrow come before my window I take part in its existence and pick about the gravel"; and Goethe on the sheep pictured by the artist Roos, "I always feel uneasy when I look at these beasts. Their state, so limited, dull, gaping, and dreaming, excites in me such sympathy that I fear I shall become a sheep, and almost think the artist must have been one." I can match this Goethe story with

the prayer of little Larry H., son of an eminent Harvard biologist. Larry, at the age of six, was taken by his mother to the top of a Vermont hill-pasture, where, for the first time in his life, he saw a herd of cows and was thrilled by their glorious bigness and nearness and novelty. When he said his prayers that night, he was enough of a poet to change his usual formula into this:

"Jesus, tender Shepherd, hear me,
Bless thy little cow to-night"—.

In the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures there is now included *Second Corinthians* by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., and the Rev. Joseph Keating, S.J., together with *Galatians* by the Rev. Alexander Keogh, S.J., and *Romans* by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J.—all in one volume (Longmans; 3s. 9d. in paper, 4s. 9d. in cloth).

Mr. G. W. S. Howson, M.A., once Headmaster of Gresham's School, was wont to preach to the boys. And he preached with such simplicity of utterance, such soundness of doctrine, such gentle persuasiveness to a good life, that three of his friends (Masters in the school?) have gathered together thirty of the sermons, and have had them published under the title of *Sermons by a Lay Headmaster* (Longmans; 6s. net).

The chief article in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, for December 1919 to July 1920 (Longmans; 2s.), is an estimate by Dr. C. H. Herford of the personality and work of Gabriele D'Annunzio. But there are other three articles of interest, one by Dr. F. J. Powicke on 'Baxter's Saints' Everlasting Rest,' one by Dr. Rendel Harris on 'The Woodpecker in Human Form,' and one by Mr. W. E. Crum on 'New Coptic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library.'

'Hard as it is to express and to analyse, I think I should say that in Katharine Macqueen's character there was a singularly happy and rather unusual combination; in which these main things stand out, viz., the gift of a rare sympathy, the spirit of adventure, a keen sense of humour, sanity of judgment, and beneath all, a deep spirituality. She eagerly desired for herself and for others the wider, fuller life. It was all this that made her

friendship for those who shared it so cheering a thing in life, and for the young an inspiration.'

That is the estimate of Katharine Stuart Macqueen, in a memoir and account of her work by Olive Maclehose. The title is *Records of a Scotswoman* (Maclehose; 7s. 6d. net). The memoir is sympathetic. The rest of the book is a transcript of Miss Macqueen's diary in the Balkans. It is a record made on the spot of the condition of things after the Balkan Wars and just before the Great War opened.

Dr. Richard G. Moulton, Professor (Emeritus) of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, has published the New Testament part of *The Modern Reader's Bible for Schools* (Macmillan; 12s. net). It contains the text of the New Testament so condensed and arranged that it may be read by 'a variety of readers, from classes of young people to students at a university, not to speak of readers outside educational institutions who may be Bible students. It is for the particular teacher, or director of study, to adapt the kind of study to the particular class of readers; but all alike need a Bible in correct literary form. The adaptation of *The Modern Reader's Bible* for such educational use sums up under three heads. 1. Large portions of the full Bible are made up of what, in a modern book, would take the form of appendices and footnotes. What we have here is documents containing legal and statistical information. This is of value for scholars, but for the general reader it is an interruption to the continuity of Scripture. All this is here omitted. 2. Even important parts of Scripture may gain by the right kind of abridgment, minor passages being omitted to make the main drift stand out clear. Sometimes such abridgment takes the form of condensation. To know the Bible it is not enough to be familiar with particular passages; the student ought to have an adequate idea of each particular book of the Bible as an independent literary work. For such a purpose, in certain cases, a whole book is condensed by the editor in his own language, in order to make its substance and purpose clear; this condensation is supported by leading passages of the book in the actual words of Scripture itself. 3. It is important that in no case should there be any modification or alteration of the grand language of the Bible: the language of Scripture can be altered only by

missions. Difference of type distinguishes the Bible itself from such things as introductions or condensations. And what appears as the Bible itself is presented in its full literary form and structure.'

Spiritual Equipment for the Last Days, by Charles H. Usher (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.), is an encouragement to the practice of the presence of God. Half of the book deals with 'The Prayer Life and How to Live it'—it is the best half.

Sir John Rose Bradford joined the army in October 1914, and soon after Lady Bradford arrived in Boulogne for work in the hospitals. She gave herself to the writing of letters for the men. And she found her occupation as interesting to herself as it was helpful to them. She took notes. And now we have the privilege and the pleasure of reading the experiences of *A Hospital Letter-Writer in France* (Methuen; 5s. net). She says:

'The last case which I shall cite of patient endurance of extreme pain is that of an air-mechanic, who had both arms and one leg fractured by the propeller of an aeroplane. He had a bright, merry smile, and, though so helpless, never uttered a murmur of complaint. I wrote many letters for him, which he always dictated himself. He had a curious selection of endings for his epistles. Among them were: "Yours to a cinder," "Yours until hell freezes," "Yours until the sands of the desert grow cold and grey," "Yours until I kick up the daisies." When he dictated the first of these endings I remarked that it was a strange expression. His reply was, "You can put 'Yours till hell freezes' if you like; or if you don't like these expressions you can put 'Yours faithfully,' but that's not so good; for you see, Sister, as hell never freezes, he's my pal for ever." This man made an excellent recovery. He has been to see me since my return to England, bringing his young wife with him.'

Messrs. Nelson have undertaken the issue of another Encyclopædia. It is to be published in ten volumes, at 3s. 6d. each. The first two are already out. It is a small, square volume, clearly printed in double column and attractively bound. The price is a surprise and an encouragement.

Each volume contains 480 pages. The title is *The New Age Encyclopædia*.

In introducing the Rev. Arthur P. Pannell's *Miracles which Happen* (Nisbet; 6s. net), Professor Caldecott speaks of 'Dr. Sanday's recent announcement of his change of attitude to Miracle.' But it is not recent. It must be ten years since he announced the change. And the important point is that he made it in his vigorous manhood and held by it to the end.

Mr. Pannell is after the same mind. But he endeavours to carry the idea a step nearer acquiescence. If the New Testament miracles can be explained naturally, as Dr. Sanday believed, Mr. Pannell tries to show how. His secret is *suggestion*. This, for example, is his explanation of the healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter: 'Would it not be very probable, nay, almost certain, that the child and all those who were around her, or had seen her in the paroxysms of the disease, were aware that the wonder-working, compassionate Jesus was in the neighbourhood; and that already the child, knowing her mother had gone to seek aid from one who had so seldom failed those who had come to Him, would be expectant, and thus have her mind prepared for the cure to operate before even the mother had asked Christ to help her?'

Five Years' Hell in a Country Parish (Stanley Paul; 5s. net) is an amazing title. But it is the title of an amazing book. The present Rector of Rusper, a parish near Horsham in Sussex, tells the story of his troubles during the first five years of his residence there. The Rev. Edward Fitzgerald Synnott, M.A., is the Rector. Why the parishioners persecuted him so is a puzzle. From his portrait he is a handsome man to look at: from his book he has both humour and conscience. But what will the parishioners do now, when they read the book?

Mr. Coulson Kernahan has written once more against Spiritualism. He calls the new book 'plain speaking and painful facts about spiritualism.' The title is *Black Objects* (R.T.S.; 3s.).

Two capital Christmas books for ambitious and observant boys have been published by Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. Both have been written by

Mr. C. A. Ealand, M.A. One is *The Romance of the Microscope* (7s. 6d. net), the other *Animal Ingenuity of To-day* (7s. 6d. net). Both are nicely illustrated, the 'Animal Ingenuity' volume most lavishly. It is a demonstration to the eye, irresistibly convincing, that in the animal world the struggle for existence is a serious reality.

A Book of Prayer for Students (S.C.M.; 3s. net), first published in 1915, now appears in a second edition, revised and enlarged.

The editor of the numerous books published by the Student Christian Movement is determined to bring us 'back to Jesus.' He knows very well that when we have got back we are only at the beginning. He is determined to bring us back just that we may begin at the beginning. For this was Jesus' own way—'Except ye turn and become as little children'; 'Except a man be born again'—begin at the beginning. And the early disciples began there.

The School of Jesus, by Mr. G. R. H. Shafto (S.C.M.; 3s. net), is 'a Primer of Discipleship.' It takes us back to the early disciples, to the place where they began.

J. Angell James, R. W. Dale, J. H. Jowett, Sidney M. Berry—that is the succession in Carr's Lane Chapel, Birmingham, is it not? And they are proud of the succession, so proud that they call it 'Chapel' still while all around them the chapels have become churches. They are proud of their present pastor. And they have reason. He has published twenty-three of his ordinary sermons—*The Crucible of Experience* (Allenson; 7s. 6d. net). He has published them as he preached them. It is easy to see the occasion of his people's pride.

And yet what a contrast to James, to Dale, to Jowett. Where is the fervent emotional appeal of Angell James? the full period and convincing argument of R. W. Dale? the intense evangelical penetrativeness of J. H. Jowett? This is wholly different. The topics are of to-day (or say yesterday, for the war is over now); the treatment is a wise man of the world's. But emphasize 'wise'—he is so different from an unwise worldly man. For example:

'When we are told that people are not troubling about their sins to-day it is sometimes taken as a

sign that the modern man has intellectually outgrown an older phase of experience. It is far more likely, however, that he has missed something which is essential to all great experience. His easy-going indifference is a badge of mediocrity, not of superiority. He may be calm and self-possessed because he has not seen anything big enough to shake him. A life without a sense of disconcerting depths is merely the other aspect of a life which has never seen the heights. I would venture to say that no man or woman has ever attained anything like greatness of life or achievement who has not said again and again, "Woe is me."'

A thoroughly good manual of instruction for Sunday School teachers—instruction in the motives, aims, methods, and manners of teaching—is *The Greater Things of the Sunday School*, by J. Eaton Feasey (S.S. Union; 2s. 6d. net).

The Sunday School Union has issued its 'Notes' for 1921. There are three volumes as before. First, *Notes on the Scripture Lessons* (6s. net), a large octavo volume, printed in larger and smaller type, sometimes even in double column, and containing (1) Subject-Studies for Seniors, (2) Notes on the British International Lessons, and (3) Notes on the Primary Lessons. Next, *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (2s. 6d. net), a much smaller book, packed with illustration and idea in the smallest possible type for even excellent eyes. Those volumes are both edited by Mr. J. Eaton Feasey. The third is *The International Lesson Pocket Notes* (2s. net), by Mr. W. D. Bavin. Was the type of the second book the smallest possible? It seemed so till this book was opened. Why is it made up for the pocket? No teacher can read it by the way or in the train, nor can it be snatched at hastily in the class. But it is amazingly clever.

Books are expensive in these days, but no one will grudge the price of the fine volume on *The Life of Christ* which Messrs. Partridge have published at a guinea. The author is Mr. G. Robinson Lees, M.A. The illustrations in colour are done by Mr. Frank O. Salisbury, and those in black and white by Mr. T. H. Robinson. There are four of the former and sixteen of the latter.

Mr. Robinson Lees is a writer of books on Palestine, a writer of fresh informing books. We

look for clear vision, local colour, the entrance into the Syrian's mind. And we find it all. But, more than that, we find a certain creative imagination which gathers up the Scripture narrative and its environment into a picture that is vivid and arresting. Take one example: it is not too long.

'Cautious on account of his position, timid in his method of approach, with a dim foreshadowing of a greatness he could not comprehend, Nicodemus came to Jesus by night. From his stately mansion in the city, by the light of the Passover moon, the ruler threaded his way through the dense crowd of transitory dwelling-places on the slopes of Olivet to the temporary abode of Jesus. In the courtesy of Oriental language he addressed Him in the hope of receiving some assurance that he was right in assuming His works were the signs that He had come from God. He accosted Him as if he had been the deputy of a party representing the current opinion of the people; and the collective form of his opening remarks has led some men to believe he was sent by the Sanhedrin to prepare conditions of an agreement on which they might appeal to the nation.

'Our Lord answered him in the plural number, because it was the most suitable reply for the occasion. Nicodemus had identified himself with

his associates; Jesus followed his lead and answered in the corporate capacity of Himself and His followers. He invariably dwelt with men who were sincere in their desire for knowledge by taking His stand with them on their platform, on the basis of a mutual understanding from whence, if they were willing, He might lift them into the higher plane of His own life. Even when they hesitated their reluctance was not due to His teaching, but to their lack of appreciation. Having met Nicodemus on the ground of his appeal as a member of a community, He proceeded to reveal to him the fact of individual responsibility. The personal life of a Jew was absorbed in the race; the man was a part of the people; his religion was national; he believed all the promises of God were for the commonwealth, and every member of it was, by the nature of his position, a recipient. Christ came to teach the value of the individual soul, to proclaim a tremendous change as the necessary condition for recognizing it; that without this new movement, which He termed being born again, no one could participate in the true privileges of God's children. Man must be separated from his people, and in his own person realize the fundamental moral principles of the new life, and become convinced by his own vision of its reality, before he could enter into it.'

Notes on John xi.

BY THE REVEREND ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF THE
UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

THE interpretation of the whole narrative of this chapter depends largely on the meaning of v.³⁸. What caused the deep emotion of our Lord which is described by the words, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν? Ἐμβριμάομαι (also in v.³⁸) denotes the feeling of anger and indignation. In Mk 14⁵, following ἀγανακτοῦντες, it implies the expression of such feelings; in Mt 9⁸⁰ and Mk 1⁴³ the great displeasure which it would cause if something were done. As qualified in these verses by τῷ πνεύματι and ἐν ἑαυτῷ, the indignation is to be understood as expressed not by words but by look or gesture, as on the occasions recorded in Mk 3⁵ and

5^{39, 40}, when He cast forth the 'wailers' in the house of Jairus. One thing that always stirred our Lord's indignant anger was unbelief that rejected His gospel, or opposed its progress, or, by hypocrisy, discredited it (Mt 11²⁰ 17¹⁷ 23¹⁵, etc.). It was the cause of that indignant displeasure which was now manifest to those accompanying Him. The other much-debated phrase ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν is more easily explained. It is sometimes taken as synonymous with the foregoing; but the successive aorists, linked by καί, indicate historic progress. Ταράσσω means to stir up, or rouse, as chap. 5⁷; and in this sense it is to be understood here. The evangelist records the

visible change as our Lord, who had seemed passive in sympathy, was by His indignation moved to action—He bestirred Himself.¹ The thought is familiar in the O.T., as in Ps 35²³ 80², etc., and Is 64⁷. The word occurs in the LXX, Gn 43³⁰, to describe the overmastering feelings of Joseph which compelled him to seek where to weep. So our Lord's resolve to act found its expression in His immediate question, 'Where have ye laid him?' He was yet without the village in the place where Martha met Him; but now He hastens to the tomb to do that which He had come to do, thereby to vindicate and establish the faith in Him which was assailed, and, by some standing by, was mocked and resented (vv. 37. 46. 48. 53). If these words are thus understood the whole story of this chapter becomes luminous. Some have interpreted them as telling of our Lord's anger and indignation, or even horror, of death and its evil power. But that is inconsistent with our Lord's words about death (v. 11) as sleep (Mk 5^{39. 40})—this was His manner of speaking of it. The remark of Westcott (*in loco*) that 'the unbelief or misapprehension of the Jews, and even of the sisters, have not been brought into prominence in the narrative' is surprising. One has only to note the number of times the word πιστεύω occurs to see that it is all about faith (vv. 15. 25. 26. 27. 40. 42. 45. 48). Why so, if not to meet unbelief?² Read with this in view, the whole narrative acquires fresh interest; the opening verses of the story becoming a reverent revelation of the trial and the strength of our Lord's own faith. The questions spring naturally in the heart of every reader, Why did He, who was so 'ready to save,' deliberately delay for two days to go to Bethany? Why, if He could not go, did He not 'speak the word' as He healed the centurion's servant or the nobleman's son, fever-smitten in the distant Capernaum? No doubt it was well for the sorrowing sisters in the end, as, indeed, is hinted at when, after telling of the Lord's delay, the evangelist adds, 'But Jesus loved (ἡγάπα) Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus.'

¹ So we say, of one troubled about a matter, that he spared himself no end of trouble regarding it.

² Our Lord's words (v. 40), which clearly refer to v. 4—the reply, which He returned, by their messenger, to the sisters' appeal—were, if not a rebuke of unbelief, a reminder that these 'daughters of Abraham' should have glorified God by their faith (Ro 4²⁰, He 11¹⁹), and not have assumed that death limited His power to make good His word.

The word is emphatic. The sisters' message ran, 'He whom thou lovest'—ὃν φιλεῖς—whom thou hast called 'friend.' They were to learn that Christ was a brother, better than a friend. The words are here contrasted as in chap. 21^{15-17. 20}.

When we look more closely into these verses a deeper and more significant question presses for answer. What is the significance of the Lord's answer to the remonstrance of the disciples against His going back to Judea, where, so recently, He had scarce escaped stoning to death? 'Are there not,' He said, 'twelve hours in the day? If one walk in the day he does not stumble because he sees the light of the world; but if one walks in the night he stumbles because there is no light in it.' He was waiting for light. It was not that He made up His mind not to go to Bethany for two days; but that for those days He waited for light, which He was sure would come, as to His Father's will (see chap. 8²⁹). When it came He set out, doubting and fearing nothing. As to what His feelings were these days of waiting the evangelist says nothing. The words of v. 4 were evidently spoken when the message from Bethany first reached Him, and were taken by the sisters to mean that Lazarus would recover. But Jesus said not that Lazarus would not die, but that the event—whatever it was—would not only be to the glory of God, but 'that the Son of God would be glorified thereby.' His faith in His Father's love to Him was untroubled by the nearing prospect of His last journey to Jerusalem. Waiting for the guidance of His Father's will, He knew that whatever happened, sufficiency for it would be His even if Lazarus should die e'er He might go to him. The faith He declared a year ago in the wonderful words of chap. 5¹⁹⁻²³ was steadfast. Yet we cannot doubt that these two days of waiting were days of trial for Him who loved these sisters and their brother. There is a note of relief in the words, 'let us go into Judea again.' It was not to be His 'going to Jerusalem,' where His death must be (Lk 13³³), He could assure His disciples that He was going to Bethany to awake Lazarus from sleep—He spoke thus of death, so that His disciples learned to do so also. There is nothing in the narrative to suggest that the indignant emotion He felt was a horror of death and its triumphs. He spoke it so calmly that the disciples answered, 'Lord, if he sleep, he will recover.' He had to tell them

plainly that Lazarus was dead, adding that He was glad He was not at Bethany, so that they would have in their coming experience a great strengthening of their faith in Him. He was not terror-struck by death, for its happening would be to His gladness and His glorifying and to their gladdening too. Surely He did not speak thus of Lazarus' death alone.

However alarming to the disciples the return to the very gate of Jerusalem seemed, there was that note of calm confidence in the Master's words which made even Thomas ready to go with Him, were it unto death.

Then in vv.²⁰⁻²⁷ we have the Lord's interview with Martha, and it is all about her faith in Him—an appeal to believe in His power of life—even life eternal. Yes; she has believed, and does believe, that He is the Son of God, the coming One who is all Israel's hope; but, as the sequence shows, she has to experience a proving of her faith which shall be to the praise and honour and glory of her Lord, and her own joy unspeakable (1 P 1^{7, 8}).

Vv.²⁸⁻³⁴ next relate the deeply affecting story of Mary's sorrow as she poured it out at Jesus' feet—using the very words of her sister, 'Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died'—not as at all meaning to blame or upbraid Him, but as those sorrowing for their beloved so often do, thinking of how death would not have come had this or that not happened. It is noticeable that our Lord did not speak to Mary as He did to Martha. She was prostrate with grief. Accompanying her were 'many' who had come from Jerusalem to lament with the sisters, and though they may not be classed with the 'wailers' in the house of Jairus, they cannot be regarded as sharing Mary's faith in and love for her Lord (vv.^{37, 46}). There was thus present an element not only of unbelief but of hostility to Jesus, an evil influence which would—if it could—persuade Mary and her sister that if He had cared to do so He might have caused that Lazarus should not have died. Unbelief ever roused the holy indignation of Jesus. He found it hard to bear (Mk 9¹⁹), and now He saw that 'it was time to work,' lest these unbelieving wailers should make void faith in His Word (Ps 119¹²⁶). In vv.³⁸⁻³⁵ we have the notes of a spectator. The Lord's displeasure was manifest, and His resolve to act, to answer the challenge of His enemies, and to

satisfy the desire of those that hoped in Him.

Visibly He roused Himself to act. As Luther well renders Is 64⁷, 'Macht sich auf.' Then He said, 'Where have ye laid him?' and followed Martha to the tomb. There the disciples saw and were amazed as the silent tears fell from His eyes. How near to them He was—how far off from those miserable wailing comforters!

His command to take away the stone from the cave's mouth caused the realistic Martha to ask, 'Why are they taking away the stone?'¹ and to suggest that it was more than too late to do so. Our Lord's reply shows what was in His mind—'Said I not unto thee, that, if thou believedst, thou shouldst see the glory of God.'

The Lord's prayer in vv.^{41, 42} reveals the same spirit of faith, and the same need of faith as His one requirement of those for whom He wrought. As He believed, He would have all the bystanders to believe also. He says He had prayed for this. Does He not here refer to His waiting on His Father before He came from beyond the Jordan to Bethany with the assurance that He would wake Lazarus from sleep?² He told of this answer to His prayer—as His prayers were always heard—that all should believe that He was sent from the Father, and had not come of Himself. Then, in the faith that the Father would 'do the work,' he summoned the dead to come forth; and he came forth. Vivid as has been the detailed narrative hitherto as only a spectator could have told it, it closes abruptly. We are left to imagine the scene of the restored household, and to wonder what, if anything, Lazarus told.

Behold a man raised up by Christ!

The rest remaineth unrevealed;

He told it not; or something seal'd

The lips of that evangelist.

Such witness would not have helped faith (vv.^{25, 27}).

It is impossible to think that this manifestation of Christ's power over death had no purpose of strengthening the hearts of those that believed in

¹ So in Sinaitic Syrian Text.

² Our Lord's 'thanksgiving' not only reveals that power to raise the dead had been asked in prayer for the glory of God in the faith of 'many'—not spectators of the miracle only (vv.^{45, 48}); it reveals also that His own faith had passed through conflict and had triumphed—'Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me—but *I knew* that thou hearest me always.'

Him, as they had to hear with growing perplexity His now constant insistence on the nearness of His death. Ought it not to have confirmed their faith in His assurance that He had power to fulfil His Father's commandment 'to lay down his life, and to take it again' (Jn 10¹⁸)? Ought it not also to have warned His enemies that there was nothing they could do against Him though they put Lazarus to death, and Himself also? And still a question haunts us which must be reverently considered—had this incident not some relation to our Lord's own faith in the prospect of death? Was it a light on His way to the Cross? Was it for His strengthening (Lk 22⁴³) to hold fast as the Father's pledge to Him the words of Ps 16⁷⁻¹¹ :

I will bless the LORD, who hath given me counsel ;
Yea, my reins instruct me in the night seasons.
I have set the LORD always before me :
Because He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.
Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth :
My flesh also shall dwell confidently.
For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol ;
Neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.
Thou wilt make me to know the path of life ;
Fulness of joy is in thy presence ;
Pleasures are in thy right hand for evermore.

Surely it was from Himself the apostles learned the meaning of that Psalm (Ac 2²⁵⁻²⁸) as the assurance of His rising again the third day. Does not this constitute the chapter a narrative of our Lord's own faith—its trial, and its source of strengthening to victory?

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

God's Star.

'We have seen his star.'—Mt 2².

WHEN Christmas comes we love to remember the Christ-child who came to dwell among us. We think of what it cost Him to leave His heavenly home and His loving Father. I wonder if we sometimes think what it cost God to send Him? Perhaps a story which I heard the other day may help us to understand it.

During the War those families in America which had sent a son to fight were allowed to put a star in their window. When the light shone inside the room the star showed up.

One evening, just at twilight, a small boy was walking with his father along the streets of New York; and as they walked they were counting the stars in the windows. 'See, Father,' said the boy, 'here's a window with one star, and here's another with two—they must have sent two sons—and here's another with none at all.' They came at last to a break in the houses where the evening star twinkled in the western sky, and the boy whispered, 'Look, Father, God has a star in His window. God must have sent a son too.'

Yes, God has sent His Son too. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.'

He gave the very best He had, and He gave it because He loved so much.

Once a famous preacher asked the scholars of a certain Sunday school whether God loved boys and girls when they were wicked. Some answered 'Yes,' but most of them said 'No.' And then the minister told them that if God didn't love them when they were wicked, He could never love any of them at all, because 'all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' It was just because God loved boys and girls and men and women when they were wicked, that He sent His Son to save them, that He gave the gift that cost Him so dearly.

That story reminds me of a tale that is told of another famous preacher, the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse. One day he overheard one of his children say to another, 'You must be good or Father won't love you.' He called the boy to him and said, 'Do you know what you are saying, my boy? That is not true; it is not a bit true.' The boy was astonished and asked, 'But you won't love us if we are not good, will you?' And the minister replied, 'Yes, I will love you when you are not good. I love you when you are good with a love that makes me glad, and I love you when you are not good with a love that hurts me; but I cannot help loving you, because I am your father, you know.'

God cannot help loving us, because He is our Father, God could not help sending His Son, because He loved us so much.

So, when you walk abroad in the twilight and see the evening star twinkling in the sky, will you think of the love that made God give His dearly beloved Son; will you think of the Christ who is Himself the bright, the morning star; will you think of the Star of Bethlehem which led the Wise Men of old to the very feet of Jesus?

'Say Grace.'

'He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them.'—Lk 9¹⁶.

Did you ever wonder why we 'ask a blessing' or 'say grace' at meals? A blessing is one of the very first prayers we learn. Indeed, we are usually so tiny at the time that we can't say a grown-up blessing, and are taught a special one of our own made up of short words, such as—

'God bless this food,
And make me good.'

or just, 'Thank God for my good breakfast'; 'Thank God for my good dinner.'

I once knew a little girl who was so small that she couldn't even speak, but she understood about a blessing. She watched her father and her mother and her older sisters all bending their heads when food was on the table, and she too shut her eyes tight whilst father reverently said grace. One day, about Christmas time, her mother was preparing the fruit for the plum pudding. The raisins and the currants and the candied peel were laid out on plates on the dining-room table, and just before mother began to stone the raisins she drew Kitty's baby chair up to the table beside her. What was her astonishment when Kitty bent her curly head, folded her little hands, closed her eyes and solemnly said something that sounded like 'M—m—m' over the fruit for the Christmas pudding?

Yes, saying grace is one of the first things we learn. But do you know it is one of the oldest customs in the world? It is a custom we have borrowed from the Jews. The Jews believed in blessings. They believed in blessing people. They believed in blessing food; and by and by the blessing grew into a thanksgiving to God the Giver. The first blessing of food we read about is in the ninth chapter of the First Book of Samuel. There we are told that the people would not eat of

the sacrificial meal till Samuel the prophet had blessed it.

Later in their history the Jews became very particular about grace before and after meat. They had quite a number of rules on the subject. The grace which they said before eating bread was very probably the grace which Christ used when He looked up to heaven and blessed the five loaves and the two fishes before dividing them among the multitude. Would you like to know that blessing? The Bible does not give it us, but other Jewish books do, and here it is: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who bringeth forth bread from the earth.'

Besides this grace before meat, there was another to be used before drinking; and there were no fewer than four graces after meat from which to choose. At the feast of the Passover too there were special blessings at certain stages of the meal.

The early Christians continued the custom of thanksgiving at meal times, and so the practice has been handed down from generation to generation; and although we don't have so many blessings as the Jews had, most of us still thank God before meals, and some of us thank Him after meals as well.

Now, sad to say, there are some people who thank God for His goodness *neither before nor after* meals. They simply leave God out. These people remind me of the story of the hungry man who was once taken to a hall where plates were laid for no fewer than 1460 persons. The tables were groaning with tempting food of all kinds, and the hungry man felt his teeth water. 'Would you like a meal?' asked his guide. 'Rather!' replied the man. 'May I sit down?' 'Not till I have told you something,' said the guide. 'These plates stand for the meals you have eaten during the last twelve months. There are 365 breakfasts, 365 dinners, 365 teas, and 365 suppers. You see what a lot of food they amount to; yet you have never thanked God for one of them.'

But there are others who do thank God for His mercies and then immediately start to grumble right through the meal. 'The soup is too hot; the meat is tough; and ugh! they hate milk puddings!'

These people remind me of the little girl who always said as grace, 'For what we are about to

receive, O Lord, make us truly thankful.' But until she grew quite big she thought the words were 'For *quarter* about to receive, O Lord, make us truly thankful.' She imagined she was to give thanks for only the quarter of what she ate. I'm afraid some of us are not truly thankful even for the quarter.

You have heard of Dr. Paton, the famous missionary to the New Hebrides. At one time there was a famine in the islands, and the natives looked forward eagerly to the arrival of the missionary ship, the *Dayspring*, because it brought food. One morning the vessel arrived, and the stores were unshipped and carried to the storehouse. A group of native children watched the scene, and when all the goods had been packed away they asked Dr. Paton if he had forgotten his promise that they should each have a biscuit. Oh no, he had not forgotten, but he had waited to see if they would remember. Of course they had remembered, and would he please open the cask quickly for they were dying for biscuits. So Dr. Paton opened the cask and gave each boy and girl a biscuit. To his surprise they all stood round, but not one of them began to eat. He asked them why they were waiting. They had said they were dying for biscuits, and yet nobody was eating. Did they expect another one? Then one of the oldest said: 'We shall first thank God for sending us food, and ask Him to bless us all.' And so they did, and then they all munched happily God's latest gift.

I somehow think those little black boys and girls could teach their white brothers and sisters a lesson. Don't you?

The Christian Year.

THE FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Poverty.

'The poor ye have always with you.'—Jn 12⁸.

1. He understood the word 'poor' better than many of us do. For Him it meant not an abstract idea, but a lifelong experience. Each Christmas brings home to the Church afresh the hard, mean, prosaic realities of our Lord's earthly lot. To be born in a barn, and brought up in a cottage, to earn His bread at a labourer's bench, to choose workmen for His familiar friends, to wander without home or shelter, to borrow His very grave at

last—this was the life which He chose, who, though He was rich, for our sakes became poor. And even in His acceptance of the spikenard, Christ identifies Himself with man's low estate. It might have been sold and given to the poor. 'The poor?' He seems to say; 'I am the Poor.' He claims in His own Person to be the image and representative of all human need and hardship—just as He felt in Himself the anguish and bore the sin of the whole world. How calmly He said it: *The poor ye have always with you.* Yet even as He spoke He must have realized those multitudes for whom existence is one 'long doing-without, more or less patiently'; He must have seen the vast armies of poverty 'passing in sad procession from the cradle to the grave.' Surely He saw also moral and spiritual compensations which are hidden from us. He who knew what is in man regarded wealth, not want, as one main hindrance and drawback to the soul. He looked upon the state of the humble as actually a privilege in disguise.

2. At any rate our Lord treats the existence of this grim fact, not as a problem, but as an appeal. He assumes and implies that poverty, as such, has a claim for spikenard. And *spikenard we have always with us.* We all possess something costly to communicate, we all have something precious that is worth giving away. Mere money is generally the cheapest of gifts, and the least useful. The poor who have the chief claim on us to-day are not perhaps the destitute; they are the stupid, the ignorant, the weak, the lazy, the coarse, the sensual, the unstable, the forlorn—those folk whom we class consciously as 'inferiors.' Multitudes of them would be unhappy if they were transported into an earthly paradise to-morrow. But so much the more does their moral poverty plead for our sympathy and our devotion. In so far as we feel ourselves richer than they—richer in faith and affection, in energy and patience and self-control—they call for our spikenard. And each of them stands to us in the place of Christ Himself. Though they be idle or dissolute or undeserving, this is the very measure of their claim. Him we have not always; but we have always those with whom He has made Himself one, with whom He bids us deal as though they were He. Our gifts carry virtue only in so far as they are fragrant with the spikenard of the heart.

3. The conventional marriage of religion and respectability was never made in heaven. Mediæval

artists loved to paint a very different bridal—the marriage of Francis and Poverty. The men who gazed at that fantastic picture felt that it expressed in a parable the very genius of the gospel. And it is repeated as often as gifted men and women quietly forgo their position and forget their pleasures, that they may claim kinship with the disinherited and pour out their spikenard on the travel-stained feet of the poor. The aroma of such devotion puts new meaning into our hollow phrases. It proves how that poverty which seems to impeach our faith in God's mercy can serve to strengthen and confirm it. For the gospel remains vague and theoretical to every man who does not lay hold of the mighty truth at his heart—the truth of the redeeming sacrifice of love. It reveals its secret to the man who is overwhelmed by a sense of the evils and sorrows of his race, and who grasps its divine power to succour and to save his fellows. Christian faith flickers and dies away in the breast of the student, the dreamer, the religious sentimentalist. It flames up in the heart of the man who pours himself out for the needy, and spends himself in patient fidelity to unthankful and unstable souls. There is a blessing even in the dreadful fact of poverty, when it pierces us and makes us real.¹

THE FIRST SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

Seeing Jesus.

'Sir, we would see Jesus.'—Jn 12²¹.

Jesus has exerted an undying attraction over the minds of the centuries. Whatever position Jesus comes finally to occupy in the minds of free, thoughtful men, a place for Him is assured among the great teachers of the world, which will nearly always be the highest. Every one must realize that there is in His teaching a wealth of meaning which can hardly be matched even in the greatest philosophers. His sayings have nothing of the volume which, for instance, those of Plato have; they cannot be easily made into a system held together by a few dominant ideas. But, for that particular type of aphoristic speech, it measures a considerable quantity, and there seems such a tremendous deal tied up in almost every word. The very form of the teaching of Jesus has helped to secure for it immortality, for its meaning does not lie upon the surface. And yet it is never mere

enigma, which one soon gets tired of investigating; obscure symbolism, which we soon conclude means nothing at all. Confronted with a saying of Jesus, all the instincts of the soul are aroused, as if behind its form it detected the savour of its natural food. The teaching of Jesus sets one craving for its secret, not only that we may know it, as one might learn a scientific secret, or gain occult knowledge, but in order that we might find it operative in one's life. We have the feeling that the teaching of Jesus matters—matters for our own peace of mind, matters for the righting of our wronged and ruined society.

1. The first desire that is awakened is, therefore, to discover the *mind* of Jesus, to be able to find the angle from which He viewed life, to get down to the great principles which governed His thinking. Yet whenever we do this we find ourselves baffled; to systematize His thinking seems to destroy half its power.

(1) Take the popular principles of 'the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man,' to which some thinkers have reduced His thinking, and how tame it seems beside His own pregnant words.

(2) Or take the idea that all His teaching is by reference to the inner point of view, judging things by their motive, seeing to it that the heart is right; how much this seems to leave out, and when stated thus how much less disturbing than the words He flung about Him like firebrands.

(3) Or take His outlook on social wrong as able to be reduced to the one principle of using no violence to restrain evil, which Tolstoy seizes upon as the centre and core of Christ's moral teaching; it throws a confusing light upon our own institutions, but it seems to produce nothing but wild and academic discussions as to what would happen in a society which dispensed with coercion.

(4) Or take the principle which some have felt to be determinative for His attitude towards moral problems, the principle of regarding sin as injuring only the sinner, and therefore something to be sorry rather than angry about, something from which we should wish to save the sinner rather than punish him for; how merely passive and pathetic this is in comparison with the great passion of Jesus, which was as hot with sorrow as we ever get with indignation.

2. But we must see Jesus Himself. We are bound to feel that there is something deeper in

¹ T. H. Darlow, *Holy Ground*.

Jesus than His mind, profound as that is. He is not mere thinker only; behind His thought there is His personality; and that is the modern quest. We want to see the man, not merely find His mind as recorded in a book; for the teaching refuses to yield the ultimate secret of Jesus. This search is for His 'personality' in the modern sense of the term; that is, for the impression that the whole man makes upon us. For Jesus was more than a teacher; He lived a very active life; He was caught in the swirl of circumstances, and extricated Himself in a most wonderful way. For while in one sense He was the victim of blind circumstance, as tragic as human history can present, it is also perfectly clear that He not only conquered circumstance, in the sense that He triumphed in spite of it; he actually used all the untoward things in His career as the instruments of His purpose, and turned every detail of His terrible defeat into the emblems of His victory.

The modern mind loves to study Jesus in the great crises of His career, and watch His personality as it is revealed in the moments of temptation, difficulty, or even despair. The modern method of studying Jesus is to ignore the details of His life, but to grasp its general outlines, and to fasten attention upon the turning-points of His career, such as the baptism, the temptation, the march to Jerusalem, the agony in the garden. Here we come across an unexpected discovery. It is an extraordinarily human personality that is thus revealed. He feels so intensely; events smite upon Him; He is so temptable, as temptable as any man; He shrinks from pain, shame, and failure, and groans and sweats under the prospect of death. Sometimes concentration upon this aspect alone has produced the impression in superficial minds that Jesus was either cowardly, or else very highly strung, and almost neurotic. But this is corrected by the least attention to facts, because the temptation is so splendidly rejected, the fear is so gloriously overcome; and whatever the dread He had in anticipation, when the end is arrived it is faced majestically. There are some natures which seem superior to either temptation or fear when it is presented to them beforehand abstractly, yet they go down in the actual test without a fight; and though they are brave enough in contemplation of the event, they are utterly undone when suffering is upon them. Jesus is exactly the reverse. He fights the temptation in

the desert, feeling it as something desperate, a struggle with wild beasts and against all the wiles of the devil; and then when the actual temptation comes to Him afterwards in His career, there does not seem a moment's hesitation. He weeps and prays in the garden at contemplation of what He has to go through; but once in the hands of His captors, judges, and executioners, He is all dignity and calmness. It is upon the total character and temperament which we call personality that the modern mind fastens, and in this it finds a most extraordinary attraction.

3. But there is another sense in which we wish to see Jesus. We want to see not only what He is, but *who* He is. It is a curious question, and some have declared that it is vain and irrelevant; but it has always been asked, Who is this Christ? Objectors to this question, which they say will only involve us in metaphysics, where we shall lose all reality, tell us that we never ask such questions about Plato or Shakespeare or Darwin or Napoleon or Nietzsche. We do not say, Who is this person? It is meaningless to do so: personality in this sense is unique; it is a special creation. Shakespeare is Shakespeare, and that is an end of it. But there is just the difference: we do ask this question about Jesus.

Many answers have been returned, and they are all of them worth considering. Modern thought is determined to answer the question freely and without reference to the decisions of the past. The modern occultists believe that Jesus is one of the great supernatural personalities who rule the destinies of the human race; but that is a very odd answer; for who are the *other* great supernatural personalities? The answer of liberal theologians is very various, but it hovers round the idea that Jesus is some specially endowed being who has been commissioned by God to carry out certain religious purposes of revelation or redemption. But this is really only the Hebrew Messiah notion in modern form, and it was this very idea that Jesus both accepted and rejected; which, because He could neither deny nor fulfil, He was handed over to death. Other liberal answers content themselves with what in the absence of a theory of divinity amount to adulation or even idolatry.

There is a mass of clear teaching which either directly or indirectly assumes a special relation of Jesus to God and man. The former has been

stretched on proof texts until we are weary of it ; but the other is still unspoiled, and is probably unspoilaible. Jesus has a strange habit of regarding Himself as integrated in the life of humanity, and has a curious personal concern for men. It comes out in : 'Whoso receiveth a little child in my name, receiveth me'; in the 'inasmuch' judgment; in the weeping over Jerusalem, and in the call 'Come unto me'; to take only a few of those less used as proof texts. Jesus seems to stand in the heart of humanity and call from thence. And that is precisely what gives Him His unfading power. It is the sense that He is not far back in history, but here—wherever humanity is; that He speaks not from a printed page, but from somewhere within the heart.¹

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS.

The World.

'My kingdom is not of this world.'—Jn 18³⁶.

Although Jesus said this, we are not to conclude that the world is wholly evil. Our Lord did not say that the world is wholly mad or wholly bad, that it means simply nothing or means only ill. He did not hate it, nor did He despise it. He certainly thought and taught that the other world is the only one which it is worth our while to live for; yet He recognized all along the importance of the present world as the sphere in which human spirits are to be disciplined for that other. This world is, in fact, a school or training-ground or gymnasium; 'just a stuff,' as Browning writes, 'to try the soul's strength on, educe the man'; just a great apparatus of drill for eliciting our faculties and preparing us in a thousand ways for our future destiny. 'Call the world, if you please, "The Vale of Soul-making,"' wrote John Keats, in one of his letters. 'Then you will find out the use of the world.' 'How are souls to be made?' he continues. 'How but by the medium of a world like this?' We may, perhaps, liken it to the environment of a boy at college. That school-life is only an episode, merely an introduction to a career; yet how ill-equipped and inefficient the adult man would be, were it not for the class-rooms and playing-fields wherein his powers have been developed! Even so this world is necessary as the scene of our education. Through the gladness, through the sadness, through the work and recrea-

tion, through the crowded events and circumstances of our everyday life here, we are being exercised and matured for the fuller, larger, higher, greater life hereafter.

1. Perhaps you will realize this better, if you consider for a moment how the world fulfils its function as the divinely appointed instrument of our spiritual education. Take the world of natural beauty. Have you not proved again and again its power to arouse and stimulate the higher faculties? Those sights and sounds of Nature—the glimmer of the dawn as it breaks over the moors, the green fields sleeping in the noontide sunshine, the hills empurpled at evening, the murmur of the wind amid a forest's endless leaves, the lark's song 'like a waterfall in the sky'—are they not invaluable elements in our spiritual development, refining sense and soul for yet more subtle and sweet experiences? Let no one be afraid of enjoying to the full all this wonderful, glowing universe. For he, without doubt, is more ready for the glories of the other world, who more perfectly appreciates the beauties and splendours of this; and he is the better fitted for the revelation of God hereafter, who has learned even here to say, in the words of the blameless king:

I found Him in the shining of the stars,
I saw Him in the flowering of His fields.

2. Or take, again, the world of business. This, too, is a 'school for spirits' that is recognized by our Lord. Mark how friendly Christ was, how sympathetic He was, towards all whom He found engaged in any honourable activity. What a value He set upon work! Why, the pictures of the religious life that are presented in His parables are simply palpitating with the strenuousness of the business world. The merchant, the farmer, the bailiff, and the builder, the servant who trades diligently with his master's money—such are the types with which He illustrated His discourse. He had never a word of blame for the men who were doing their work. He never once rebuked them because they were not employed about something more religious, something more spiritual, something higher; nay, He taught that it is only right performance of the lower that can fit men for the higher. 'If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?' Other-worldliness, therefore, does not necessitate the abandonment of our law-

¹ W. E. Orchard, *The Safest Mind Cure*.

ful occupations. God has placed us where we are, and God would train us where we are. Through the special exigencies of each special calling He would develop in each of us just those faculties and powers which will specially be needed for our future ministries. All that He looks for meanwhile in our work is the spirit of consecration.

'Plough, if you are a ploughman,' cries Clement of Alexandria, 'but know God as you plough; sail, if you love seafaring, but call on the heavenly Pilot.'

3. Or take once more the world of human friendship and affection. Here, surely, least of all is it permissible to cultivate an attitude of detachment. It is an awful mistake to fancy that heavenly-mindedness means absent-mindedness in respect of earthly relationships and ties, or that the love bestowed on man is so much love withdrawn from God. Is it not rather the case that all these tender human intimacies are the steps upon which we rise to the supreme passion of the soul, so that the more closely we attach ourselves to those who are made in God's image, the more nearly are we drawn to Him in whose image they are made?

St. Catherine of Genoa, according to the legend, once complained to her Divine Spouse, 'Lord, You bid me love others, and I can love only You.' 'Catherine,' He replied, 'whosoever loves Me, must love those whom I love.' And one of the greatest of the mystics has written, 'Be assured that the further you advance in the love of your neighbour, the further you are advancing in the love of God likewise. . . . Satan himself would not be Satan any longer if he could once love his neighbour as himself.'¹

THE FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Social Question.

'Whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober, it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us.'—2 Co 5^{13, 14}.

The social question of the twentieth century is the child of Christianity. The impulse that gave it birth, and the spirit which has nourished it throughout the centuries, came directly from Jesus Christ. There is no consciousness of the social question where Jesus Christ is not known. Pagan Africa and heathen India have the social question, but they have not the consciousness of it. They are not discussing equality of opportunity either before God or before the law, nor are they deeply concerned with the rights of women and children, and the welfare of society.

¹ F. Homes Dudden, *The Dead and the Living*.

Were it not for Christian ideals, which abhor injustice and inequality, we should not be conscious of this question to-day. Injustice and inequality could not long exist in a world where religion taught that all men have equal rights before God, and that every soul is of equal value in His eyes (Jn 3¹⁶). When religious equality became the faith of mankind, there could be no peace until law recognized political equality. Men realize to-day, as never before, that happiness depends upon development, and development upon opportunity. The essence of the social question to-day is the demand for equality of opportunity,—free scope for the development of such gifts as we have. This demand is the logical conclusion of the Christianity of Christ.

And Christianity is the solution, and the only solution, of the social question. This solution is embodied in the three elemental laws of Christianity, namely, the law of regeneration, the law of righteousness, and the law of love.

1. *The Law of Regeneration.*—Through the law of regeneration Christianity changes the nature of man, and ultimately the character of society. It is frequently said that no solution of the social question can be found so long as human nature is what it is, namely, selfish. Jesus Christ recognized this truth when He made regeneration the primary condition for entering His kingdom (Jn 3³): 'Ye must be born again.' To attempt to solve the social question without regenerating men is absurd. There can be no regenerated society apart from regenerated individuals, men who have been made partakers of the divine nature, the essence of which is unselfishness. Regeneration always precedes reconstruction. It is fatal to attempt to solve the social question of to-day and to forget or ignore the source of all the selfishness and misery of the world, namely, the fact that 'all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' Splendid work is being done to diminish the sum of human suffering and wretchedness, and we must not underestimate the value of various schemes of improvement, philanthropic, social, political, and industrial. But we must not forget that misery does not come from ignorance alone, and that it cannot be swept away by knowledge. Distress does not come from environment alone, and therefore it cannot be removed by improvement of circumstances. Suffering does not come from poverty alone, and therefore

economic changes will not annihilate it. The root of it lies deeper than these things.

2. *The Law of Righteousness.*—Through the law of righteousness Christianity has given man a new standard by which to regulate his relations with God and his fellow-men. This law is stated in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7), in the Golden Rule (Lk 6³¹), and in the summary of the law (Mt 22³⁷⁻⁴¹). Christianity is law as well as life and love. Life imparted by regeneration needs development and guidance. The heart may be regenerated, but the head may be ignorant and badly informed. Regeneration merely creates the will to do right; it does not define for man what is right. This is defined for him in the law of righteousness, embodied in the teachings and the example of Jesus Christ. He is the final authority over all life, in its social as well as in its individual aspects. Christ is 'the light of the world' (Jn 8¹²), the light of the political world, the industrial world, the intellectual world, the social world, as well as the moral and spiritual world. Christianity has not laid down definite economic rules, or enunciated political maxims, but just as it deals with psychological and ethical questions on broad general principles that are true to experience, so it takes all social problems, economic and political, and looks at them in the light of the eternal verities of the kingdom of God and the divine purpose. Christianity clearly enunciates the principles which make for social welfare, and supplies the strongest and purest motives for disinterested service.

3. *The Law of Love.*—Through the law of love Christianity offers the world an adequate dynamic for solving the social question. You do not make men good by merely telling them what goodness is; nor by setting forth the bitter consequences of wrongdoing. All this is surface work. Christianity offers us not only a power which regenerates, a standard which directs, but a dynamic which impels and empowers us to live the Christian life and apply the Christian law. It substitutes for all other motives for obedience the motive of love (2 Co 5¹⁴): 'the love of Christ constraineth us.' The secret of Christian morality in both its personal and its social aspect is that it changes duty into choice, because love is made the motive for obedience. The special gift of Christianity to men is the gift of a new nature, which is created in righteousness that flows from truth and is

impelled by love. To tell men what they ought to do is very little help toward doing it. The glory of Christianity is that it gives the knowledge of what we ought to do, and with and in that knowledge it gives the desire and power to be what God would have us to be, and to do what He would have us to do. By being both law and impulse Christianity offers the world the only dynamic adequate to the solution of the social question.¹

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Divine Image.

'Who is the image of the invisible God.'—Col 1¹⁵.

1. The New Testament begins with an account of its ideal for the individual. This account is not a definition but a portrait, the portrait of a historic person, who called Himself significantly the 'Son of Man.' The discussion of the term's meaning has lasted long and still proceeds, but here it is taken to connote two closely connected things—that Jesus of Nazareth was the typical Man, and that He is therefore the natural head of a society whose members seek to be perfect. The proof that Christianity takes Jesus for the ideal Man need not be detailed, for it is the whole New Testament. The method, however, of defining an ideal by a fact, the perfect Man by a historical person, draws with it certain consequences.

It means that the ideal is practicable, for it has been practised. Herein the Christian ideal differs from the dreams of both the philosopher and common folk. The former frankly abandons fact in order to picture the perfect, while the latter relegate their ideal either to the dim past or the dim future—with a tacit condemnation and despair of the present. Christianity urges on every one the historic example of an actual man. It has the Hebrew genius for the practical.

This method also admits an adequate ideal. No principle or set of principles, however versatile, can be as manifold as life. This is true even of the lowliest kinds of life, but much more of the noblest. The only adequate account of any type of life is that life itself. The complete definition of the ideal life, therefore, can only be the actual. Without the historic Jesus, Christianity could at best be only a phase in human history; its ideal could not be final.

¹J. McDowell, in *Record of Christian Work*.

The obvious objection to the definition of the ideal by the actual is that, however perfect the chosen individual may be, he must still be a particular man, and that the particular cannot be universal. A historic person must belong to a particular race, to a particular time, to a particular family, to a particular class of society, and these circumstances, it will be said, must of course affect his character. How could an Oriental, for instance, ever become the type of the Western world? Or a Jew the ideal of a Russian? Or a peasant of a merchant? Or a man of the First Century of the children of the Twentieth? A single historical person might perhaps be perfect in his particular lot, but it seems impossible that he be the pattern for universal man.

History disproves the argument. The unique quality of Jesus, the character that gives Him the right to the title 'Son of Man,' precisely is that He is universal. It is true that He was a Jew, of the First Century, of the Roman Empire, of the artisan class, of a village called Nazareth, but with Him none of these things were more than what the old logicians called 'accidents.' When the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews compared Him to Melchizedek 'without father, without mother, without genealogy,' he put in the phrase of the time the truth that Jesus had no limitations as have other men. An Oriental has in fact become the pattern of the Western world, a Jew of the Russian, a carpenter of kings, a man of one age of the men of many ages. The claim of the Church is that the Nazarene's dominion will spread still further, until every man of every race, language, family, caste, clime, acknowledges Jesus Christ as the ideal after whose life he ought to frame his own. The history of nineteen centuries at least saves this claim from folly. Even the enemy of Christianity must admit that it may be so. With a true instinct the Church has kept 'Palm Sunday' as a festival of joy. At first sight its shouts had better been omitted, for where were the acclaiming thousands of Olivet five days later when Calvary befell? But the deep meaning of 'Palm Sunday' was that the heart of man answers to the ideal Man. On that day 'deep called unto deep'; mankind recognized its Head. Missionaries witness that the wonder is repeated wherever Jesus is preached. In every nation men recognize the Man. Later followers of the pageant of Jesus have often, like the first, been false to their ideal,

but He remains their ideal; nation by nation, mankind is coming to acclaim Him the Man of men; His particular race, tongue, calling, class, do not count; in Him the particular merges in the universal; Jesus is in the old true sense the 'common' Man.

2. Yet there is throughout the New Testament, often explicit, always implicit, another account of every man's perfection. Its definition is the likeness of God. To trace this it is best to begin with the later Books. 'He hath granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises; that through these ye may become partakers of the divine nature'¹; 'Like as he which called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy in all manner of living; because it is written, Ye shall be holy; for I am holy'²; '[With the tongue] curse we men, which are made after the likeness of God'³; 'Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children'⁴; '[We] have put on the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him.'⁵ There is in some of these texts a theoretic flavour, as of a conclusion reached by argument; what grounds had warranted the conclusion?

The Old Testament had taught that man is created in the image of God and that Righteousness is proper to both. This doctrine reached its climax when Paul used of Christianity the phrase 'the righteousness of God.' This ascription, however, belongs rather to Paul's theology than his sociology, and a scrutiny of the context of some of the passages quoted shows that the New Testament reached the idea chiefly in another way. In it man's likeness to God springs from the relation of father and child. The passage quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians, for instance, bases the imitation of God on this relation—'As beloved children.' So the quotation from First Peter proceeds, 'And if ye call on him as Father.' Several passages in the Gospel now suggest themselves—'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God'⁶; 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven'⁷; 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect'⁸; 'Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful'⁹; 'And whosoever ye

¹ 2 P 1⁴.⁴ Eph 5¹.⁷ Mt 5⁴⁸.² 1 P 1¹⁵.⁶ Col 3¹⁰.⁸ Mt 5⁴⁸.³ Ja 3⁹.⁶ Mt 5⁹.⁹ Lk 6³⁶.

stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any one; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses.'¹ While in the Old Testament fatherhood is only a secondary attribute of God, in the New it is primary, and the predominant notion in the Old Testament—that Jehovah was the Father of the Hebrew race—gives way in the New to the idea that He is each Christian's own Father. Both the nature of the relation and the usage of the New Testament require that there follows the likeness of the two. A son is like his father.

If now it be asked in what the likeness of God consists, or in what way the character of the great Father will show itself in His children, the connexion appears between the two definitions of a man's perfection so far named. For three things are clear—that no adequate account can be given of God's character, that man's likeness to God cannot extend to the whole of the Divine nature, and that here again the impossibility emerges of framing a theoretic definition sufficient for life. The New Testament's most frequent term for the Divine character is still Righteousness, but no attempt is made to delimit it. The nearest approximation in the New Testament to an account of Righteousness, the Sermon on the Mount, stubbornly refuses to be reduced to system. It is a description, not of the science of life, but of its proper temper. The only account of the likeness of God as pattern for man in the New Testament is the portrait of Christ. The later Books again express this in theoretic terms—'The effulgence of His glory, and the very image of his substance'²; 'Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation'³; 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God'⁴; 'The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'⁵

But, earlier than the use of these philosophic phrases, the Christian consciousness had made a significant attempt to express the same thought. While Jesus' favourite name for Himself was 'Son of Man,' His disciples discovered Him to be the 'Son of God.' Whatever else this name meant, at least they saw that He was like His Father. Similarly, it is Jesus' postulate throughout all the controversies of John's Gospel that His adversaries ought to have seen for themselves that He was the

'Son,' the revelation of God—that they ought to have seen God in Him. If there be anything at all in the discourses of this Gospel that belonged to Jesus' own thought, it must include such universal pre-suppositions as this. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'—here is the natural complement of the Synoptic use of 'Son of God.' At the least the Church by the end of the first century had come to think thus of Jesus, and this creed has made Christianity. For it Jesus is at once the ideal Man and the image of God. The sonship of God, likeness to Jesus, Righteousness—these three are but different names for one thing.

3. There is, however, yet another way of putting the New Testament theory of a true man's Righteousness—a way as pervasive of the records as the two already named. When at Jesus' baptism 'there came a voice from heaven saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased,' there descended also 'the Spirit' upon Him. The New Testament everywhere teaches that a true man has 'the Spirit.' Not long since such a theory would have been dismissed by many as mere infatuation; 'Spirit' would have been paraphrased as 'influence'; and under this vague term its existence would have been virtually denied. But so unscientific a procedure—albeit perpetrated in the name of science—is no longer possible. To-day's thought has ceased to be contemptuous of everything but materialism, and the Bible's axiom that 'Spirit,' though immaterial, is yet real, meets with better treatment than a scoff.

But even though this were still its plight, it would be impossible to rid the Gospel of the doctrine. The Baptist's prophecy of his greater successor was, 'He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit'; the hopeless sinner is he who 'blasphemes against the Holy Spirit'; the accused Christian's encouragement is, 'It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit'; what one Gospel calls the 'good things' of the 'Heavenly Father,' another sums in the single gift of the 'Holy Spirit'; Pentecost was at once the Day of the New Mankind and of the Holy Spirit; the Acts of the Apostles is just the Acts of the Spirit; any who 'received the Holy Spirit' had a right to be reckoned Christians, and so true men; Paul connects the sonship of the believer directly with the 'Spirit'; Jesus was Himself 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness'; in the greatest

¹ Mk 11²⁵.² He 1³.³ Col 1¹⁵.⁴ Jn 1¹.⁵ Jn 1¹⁸.

of Paul's chapters two definitions of the Christian ideal blend—'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God'; John makes Jesus stake the future on the 'other Paraclete.' These texts represent all schools of New Testament thought. Indeed, the New Testament is just 'the book of the Spirit.' It is not necessary to repeat the old proofs that in it the 'Spirit of

God' and the 'Spirit of Christ' are one, nor to argue that he who has another's spirit and none other is sure to grow really like him. He who receives God's Spirit becomes Christ-like and God-like. This third notion of true manhood is synonymous with the other two.¹

¹ C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Society in its Historical Evolution*.

The Parable of the Unrighteous Steward.

BY FREDERICK EDEN PARGITER, M.A., FORMERLY JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT, CALCUTTA;
AUTHOR OF ART. 'PURANAS' IN THE *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*.

SERMONS and discourses have often been delivered on the Parable of the Unrighteous Steward (Lk 16¹), but none that I know of has seemed really to fathom his conduct, and I venture to put forward an explanation of it, which some insight into the devious ways of unscrupulous men, gained through twenty-five years' magisterial and judicial experience in India, has suggested. I set out the parable, quoting from the Revised Version with inverted commas, and inserting remarks and comments to elucidate the meaning of the various incidents.

'There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he was wasting his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, "What is this that I hear of thee? Render the account of thy stewardship; for thou canst be no longer steward." And the steward said within himself, "What shall I do, seeing that my lord taketh away the stewardship from me? I have not strength to dig; to beg I am ashamed." He had lost his position because of dishonesty and embezzlement, and no one would employ him. He was absolutely 'broke.' The only livelihoods open to him were manual labour and begging. He had led a life of respectability and ease, hence he was physically unable to do manual work, and he could not face the shame of begging. He thought a while and then decided—'I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they (the debtors) may receive me into their houses.'

The account required of him would have shown as income (1) all the money and goods he had received, and (2) all debts of money and goods

outstanding due to the estate; and as expenditure (a) all payments made rightly by him, and (b) the amounts spent that he could not justify or account for and so had wasted (embezzled). He did not, however, apparently trouble himself to go through all his papers and draw out that account fully and correctly, but took a summary course. 'And calling to him each one of his lord's debtors, he said to the first, "How much owest thou unto my lord?" And he said, "A hundred measures of oil." And he said unto him, "Take thy bond (Greek 'writings,' that is, 'account'), and sit down quickly and write fifty." Then he said to another, "And how much owest thou?" And he said, "A hundred measures of wheat." He saith unto him, "Take thy bond (account) and write fourscore."'

He asked all those who were in debt to the estate to say how much their several debts were, and each one made his admission. Their admissions may have been correct or may have been understatements, but this question is immaterial, because he did not dispute over that and just accepted them as accurate. (If their admissions were understatements, this does not alter the following exposition, but only aggravates his and their conduct.) Instead, however, of taking from them their personal accounts accordingly, he proposed to them to write out that they owed less than they admitted. He thus offered each debtor a substantial reduction of liability. He himself was 'broke,' yet it still lay in his power to do them a seemingly good turn, and his proposal suggested to them that he was taking upon himself the liability for the difference between what they

admitted and what he told them to write down—an extra liability (besides his own embezzlements) which mattered nothing to him, because he was ruined in any case, whatever the amount of his defalcations. To them his proposal looked like a handsome and advantageous offer, dictated by magnanimously friendly feeling on his part. They naturally did not refuse that relief, and so falling in with his proposal (which the word ‘quickly’ suggests that he rather hurried them into, without giving them time for reflexion) they wrote out their accounts, falsely understating their debts.

The full significance of his conduct comes out when we examine the position he had thus created. He had induced all the debtors to write out and sign false and fraudulent accounts. They had thus put themselves into his power, and he could use his power to serve his own ends, that is, he could blackmail them. If they should try to resist his demands, he could hand them up to the lord for false and fraudulent acts, and not only would they be liable to be punished criminally, but also their characters would be blasted. They had all joined in a wholesale scheme of fraud and involved

themselves in his defalcations. He could thus live upon them thenceforward. He could oblige them to receive him into their houses and support him. He had turned his own ruin into a means of deliverance for himself. By conduct that seemed so generous on his part and so advantageous to them he had inveigled them into a position that was disastrous for them and beneficial to himself.

His lord came to know somehow or other what he had done. ‘And his lord commended (praised) the unrighteous steward because he had done wisely (astutely).’ He praised the steward’s astuteness, and no wonder, for the scheme was an extraordinarily clever piece of rascality, a masterpiece ‘of unrighteousness.’ One cannot but admire the steward’s amazing ingenuity, while reprobating his utter villainy. Certainly ‘the sons of this world (those who live only for this world or age) are for (or towards) their own generation wiser (more astute) than the sons of light’—because they are bound by no scruples. They not only possess all intellectual faculties equally with the sons of light, but they can also use their faculties in unprincipled ways wherein the latter cannot compete with them.

A New Edition of the Syriac New Testament.¹

BY PROFESSOR A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

THE issue of the first complete critical edition of the New Testament in Syriac is an important event in the history of Biblical scholarship. The Peshitta, it is true, can no longer be described, as it was by Westcott, as ‘the earliest monument of Catholic Christianity,’ while as an aid to the textual criticism of the Gospels it must now give first place to the ‘Old Syriac,’ as represented by the famous codex from Mt. Sinai and the somewhat later Curetonian manuscript. Still, the Peshitta, or Syriac Vulgate, remains an important historical witness to the text of the New Testament as read by all branches of the Syrian Church, and is the gateway through which the student must pass to the study of the older version, and indeed of the whole body of Syriac literature.

To appreciate the importance and value of the

new edition it is necessary to recall briefly the history of the more outstanding previous issues of the Syriac New Testament. The *editio princeps*, as is well known, was prepared by the scholar and statesman, J. A. Widmanstadt, Vienna, 1555, from a MS. brought from the East by a priest, Moses of Mardin.² Of the fairly numerous editions that followed, the Syriac part of the Paris Polyglot (1645) is noteworthy both as the *editio princeps* of the Old Testament Peshitta, and as giving for the first time certain of the New Testament books which are lacking in the Canon of the Peshitta, viz. the Apocalypse and the four minor Catholic Epistles, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. These had been published a few years previously at Leiden by Le Dieu and Pococke respectively.

² A detailed account—probably from the pen of Dr. Gwynn—of the preparation of this edition was given in the *Church Quarterly Review*, for July 1888, pp. 262 ff.

¹ *The New Testament in Syriac*. 7s. 6d. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1905–1920.

The Paris text of the whole New Testament was reproduced in the more familiar London polyglot of Brian Walton (1657). Since Walton's day the more important issues have been the highly prized edition of Leusden & Schaaf (Leiden, 1708), reckoned by the latter in his preface as the thirteenth edition of the Syriac New Testament, the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition of 1816, edited by Dr. Samuel Lee, and the handy Nestorian edition of the American Society (New York, 1886). The feature common to all these editions is the fact that their text is based on a very few MSS. of the Peshitta, and these on the whole not the oldest.¹

This brings us to the first edition of any part of the Peshitta to be prepared by a well-equipped scholar, familiar with the best existing MSS., the *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum Versionem*, edited by the late Rev. G. H. Gwilliam in 1901 for the delegates of the Clarendon Press. The great advance over all previous editions is evident from the fact that it is based on a collation of no fewer than forty-two manuscripts of the Peshitta, some of them dating from the fifth and sixth centuries.² It contained, in addition to a carefully punctuated text and a select critical apparatus, a Latin translation, really a revision of Schaaf's rendering. Its appearance was greeted by scholars at home and abroad as making an epoch in the study of the Peshitta.

This brief retrospect would be incomplete without a reference to two valuable publications of the erudite Syriac scholar, the late Rev. John Gwynn, D.D., of Dublin University. These are (1) a new edition of the Apocalypse (1898) from a MS. now in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, which was proved to contain the later version known as the Philoxenian, and (2) an edition of the same version of the four minor Catholic Epistles, based on a score of MSS. (Text and Translation Society, London, 1909).

Coming now to the new edition issued by the Bible Society under the direction of its accomplished Editorial Superintendent, the Rev.

¹ It is only fair to add that the text has been transmitted with extraordinary care. The variants in the existing MSS. are few and unimportant compared with those in MSS. of the Greek text.

² It may be noted here that, mainly as the result of the researches of Professor Burkitt, scholars are now generally agreed in connecting the Peshitta version of the N.T. with the activity of Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, 411-435 A.D.

Robert Kilgour, D.D., we find that, like Cæsar's Gaul, it may be said to consist of three parts. The first is a reprint of *The Fourfold Gospel* issued by the Society in 1905, which in its turn—by permission of the delegates of the Oxford Press—was a reprint of Gwilliam's text without the critical apparatus and other notes. The acknowledged excellence of this text of the Gospels has been already emphasized. The third part is also a reprint, containing Gwynn's critical text of the four minor Catholic Epistles, and of the Revelation as given in the two works referred to above. The second part, therefore, comprising the rest of the New Testament books—Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, and the Pauline Epistles, including Hebrews—alone is new. The text of these, according to Dr. Kilgour's preface, 'follows a critical revision of the Peshitta originally undertaken by Mr. Gwilliam, for the Clarendon Press, as a completion of his edition of the Gospels (1901) and prepared on similar lines.'

After Mr. Gwilliam's death in 1913 the task of collating the MSS.—some of which were additional to those consulted for the Gospels—was completed by a brilliant pupil of the present writer, the Rev. John Pinkerton, B.D., who, to the great loss of Biblical scholarship, was killed in action near the Struma on 1st October 1916. The work, as has been indicated, has been done on the lines laid down by Mr. Gwilliam; the prominent features of his text of the Gospels, such as the marks for the hard and soft 'begadkephath' letters, are retained, and of course the text only is given. It is to be hoped, however, that the Clarendon Press may be able to utilize Gwilliam's and Pinkerton's collations for a future companion volume to the former's *Tetraeuangelium*.

It is a matter of legitimate pride that the first absolutely reliable text of 'The Queen of Versions' should be given to the world by the premier British Bible Society. And not only New Testament scholars are in the Society's debt, for every branch of the Syrian Church in the Near East and in India—Nestorian, Jacobite, Maronite, and the rest—has now at its service a cheap and convenient text of the 'New Covenant of our Lord Jesus Christ,' to give the Syriac title of this new edition.

It only remains for the Society to complete its revised edition of the Peshitta Old Testament, of which the Pentateuch appeared in 1914 under the editorship of Professor Emery Barnes, 'adjuvanti-bus Carolo W. Mitchell, Iohanne Pinkerton.'

Contributions and Comments.

'Virgins' in Rev. xiv. 4.

THIS is the only place where the word *παρθένοι* occurs as a masculine. The versions translate it by 'virgins.' These 'virgin-men' (*παρθένοι*) are accorded special privileges; they are the first-fruits, and in constant attendance on the Lamb. If the reference is to *men*, then there is an implied disparagement of the married state. Swete in his commentary would understand the whole text symbolically, a forced method of interpretation. Anderson Scott (*Century Bible, Revelation, ad loc.*), on the other hand, takes the text literally, but would read it as written subject to what is said in other canonical books about marriage; and sees in *παρθένοι* a glorification of asceticism. The ascetic idea is rather strange to be associated with the warrior bodyguard of the Lamb.

I venture to suggest that light is thrown on this text from uncanonical apocalypses, as is the case indeed with reference to many other texts of our Apocalypse. In the Book of Enoch there are special punishments for those angels which had 'defiled themselves with women.' The expression occurs in Enoch 12⁴. See Enoch 15³ 19¹. The *παρθένοι* are those angels which had *not* so 'defiled themselves with women.' This view of the text obviates the other alternative that he (assuming St. John the Apostle wrote Apoc. and the 4th Gospel) who had witnessed the marriage in Cana of Galilee (Jn 2¹⁻¹¹), and speaks of the marriage of the Lamb Himself (Apoc. 19⁷ 21⁹), could write down words in disparagement of the state of marriage.

T. ISAAC TAMBYAH.

Penang, Straits Settlements.

Matthew xvi. 24.

MACARIUS in his Fifth Homily is dealing with the difference between Christians and men of this world. In paragraphs v. and vi. (Migne, *P.G.* vol. xxxiv. pp. 497-502), he compares the glory and pomp of an earthly king with the unspeakable glory of Christ, the True and Eternal King. To attain such a great glory we ought to disengage ourselves from all love of the world and draw back from every earthly clog—though this is not easy

even with so great a reward in prospect. He then quotes Mt 16²⁴ as follows:—

Εἰ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἁρᾶτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν χαίρων καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι.

This agrees with Westcott and Hort and Tischendorf (8th edition), except (1) *καθ' ἡμέραν* which is found in the parallel passage Lk 9²³, where it is attested by various MSS., but not by D and some others, and (2) the striking addition of *χαίρων*. This variant is not attested by any MSS. authority or by any other Father. It seems, however, to bring to a triumphant conclusion all that Macarius has said above. The Christian takes up his cross: he takes it up *καθ' ἡμέραν*: nay more, he takes up his daily cross gladly, exultingly, almost light-heartedly—*χαίρων*.

A. M. COLEMAN.

Marston Green.

Dr. Field's Old Testament Revision Notes.

TRANSCRIBED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MS. BY
THE REV. JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D.

VI.

NUMBERS 30⁶⁻⁸. Render: 'But if she should in any case marry, while her vows are upon her, or ought that she hath rashly uttered with her lips wherewith she hath bound her soul; and her husband hear *it*, and hold his peace in the day that he heareth *it*: then . . . she hath bound her soul shall stand. But if her husband disallow her in the day that he heareth, then he shall disannul her vow which is upon her, and that which she rashly uttered with her lips, wherewith she hath bound her soul: and the Lord shall forgive her.' וְאִם נָשָׂא וְנָשָׂא לֹא יִשְׁמַע ה' is not 'to be married' (*ὑπανδρος εἶναι*), but 'to contract marriage.' See ch. 36⁸, Ru 1¹².

NUMBERS 35¹⁷. Render: 'And if he smite him with a great stone.' Heb. 'with a stone of the hand'—that is, a stone filling the hand; in Greek *χερμᾶς* = *λίθος χειροπληθής*. I have restored the Greek word to Aquila on Job 38³⁸ for the Syriac

יָלַד, *filia manus*. Arab. Polygl. *lapide pugillari*.

NUMBERS 35²⁰. Render: 'lying in wait.' Or, 'of set purpose.' Graeco-Ven. *ἐν προθέσει*. And in v.²²: 'without lying in wait.' Or, 'without intending it.' Graeco-Ven. *ἐν οὐ προθέσει*.

NUMBERS 36⁸. Render: '... the inheritance of the tribe of those to whom they shall be married.' LXX: τῆς φυλῆς οἷς ἀν γένωνται γυναῖκες. On with לְאִישׁ יְהִיָּה see note on ch. 36⁸⁻⁹.

DEUTERONOMY 4¹². Render: 'but saw no form [μορφή, Sym. and Graeco-Ven.]; only a voice.' The *zeugma* might be retained here and 1 Co 3²: 'I gave you milk to drink, not meat.'

DEUTERONOMY 4¹⁹. Render: 'shouldest be seduced to worship . . . hath assigned . . .' And in ch. 29²⁶: 'which he had not assigned unto them.' Dathe paraphrases here: 'quae Jova ab aliis quidem terrarum orbis nationibus ut numina coeli concedit.'

DEUTERONOMY 21¹⁴. Render: 'thou shalt not exercise dominion over her.' So the Greek κατακυριεύειν (which seems to come nearest to the meaning of the Hebrew הָחֵמְרָה) is rendered Mt 20²⁵ ('lord it,' R.V.). 'In Gn 1²⁸, where the LXX have κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς, the Samaritan version has עֲמָרוּ עֲלֶיהָ' (Gesenius).

DEUTERONOMY 28⁵⁷. Render: 'and toward her afterbirth.' Or, 'and that on account of her afterbirth.' But this sense seems to be precluded by the continual repetition of וְכִי; and there is no reason why the 'evil eye' should not be represented as glancing from the *object* to the *subject* of envy; looking upon the one with malignity, and upon the other with gloating.

DEUTERONOMY 29¹⁹. Render: 'to destroy the watered land with the thirsty.' A proverbial formula, expressing the same idea as in Gn 18²³: 'Wilt thou also destroy (תִּסְכֶּה) the righteous with

the wicked?' The subject is the noxious root before mentioned. The feminine adjectives are most naturally accounted for by supplying 'land,' as הַיְבֵשֶׁת, הָאֵרָא. On הָרְוָה compare רְוָה, Is 58¹¹.

DEUTERONOMY 33⁵. The marginal renderings that I have suggested ['bars' for 'shoes,' and 'rest' for 'strength'] are rather more probable; but not so much so as to prevail (against nearly all the Ancient Versions) to eliminate from the English Bible a text which is so deservedly popular.

JOSHUA 6²⁶. 'Sware' is sufficient. It was not the people then present, so much as their posterity, whom the oath (or curse) would affect.

JOSHUA 9⁴. The marginal version [*i.e.* in R.V.] should be adopted in the text. It is quite certain. Not 'most' but *all* the Ancient Versions in Walton read ו not ר. And it is against all probability that such forms as הַיְבֵשֶׁת and הַיְבֵשֶׁת, both ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, should occur in the same narrative within nine verses. Moreover, their assuming the character of ambassadors did not prove that they came from a far country. [With reference to this note Dr. Aldis Wright (the Secretary of the O.T. Revision Company) wrote to the transcriber as follows: 'We were bound by our rules to carry every change in the text by a majority of two-thirds, and it commonly happened that what the majority preferred had to be relegated to the margin because the votes in favour of it were not two to one. We were fiercely attacked for occasionally putting the variations of the LXX into the margin, and I think we went as far as we could prudently go in that direction.']

JOSHUA 11⁵. The version 'assembled themselves' (adopted at first Revise) rather anticipates what follows: 'and they came and pitched together'; which would be avoided by rendering 'made an appointment.'

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

Giving.

'One day in Manchester,' in the depth and utmost stress of the war, a soldier who had lost an arm was standing with a friend of mine, when

some one joined them. "Well, old man," said the newcomer, "this war has taken it out of you. I see you have lost an arm." "Oh no," replied the fine fellow, "oh no, I gave it!"¹

¹ Dr. John A. Hutton, in *The Proposal of Jesus*.

The Bible.

The Chief Rabbi (Dr. J. H. Hertz) has, through the Oxford University Press, published *A Book of Jewish Thoughts* (4s. 6d. net). It is as exquisite in selection as in publication. Dr. Hertz divides his quotations into departments. Their titles are of interest: 'I am an Hebrew'—'The People of the Book'—'The Testimony of the Nations'—'The Voice of Prayer'—'The Voice of Wisdom.' After each quotation are given the name of the author and the date of the book. Fuller notes are added at the end. We shall transcribe a complete page. Its title is 'The Bible and Democracy':

This Bible is for the government of the people, by the people, and for the people.—JOHN WYCLIF, in *Preface to first English Translation of the Bible*, 1384.

Throughout the history of the Western world the Scriptures have been the great instigators of revolt against the worst forms of clerical and political despotism. The Bible has been the Magna Charta of the poor and of the oppressed; down to modern times no State has had a constitution in which the interests of the people are so largely taken into account, in which the duties so much more than the privileges of rulers are insisted upon, as that drawn up for Israel in Deuteronomy and in Leviticus; nowhere is the fundamental truth that the welfare of the State, in the long run, depends on the uprightness of the citizen so strongly laid down. . . . The Bible is the most democratic book in the world.—T. H. HUXLEY, 1892.

Where there is no reverence for the Bible, there can be no true refinement of manners.—F. NIETZSCHE.

Communication with the Dead.

The Rev. C. T. Wood, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Queens' College, Cambridge, has written a book on *Death and Beyond* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). Mr. Wood is a believer in universal restoration. Like Mr. Emmet in the volume of essays entitled *Immortality*, he is most troubled with the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats, and he sees no way with it but to suggest Apocalyptic imagery. He is also a believer in communication with the dead—a matter dealt with in other books this month—and gives three examples. This is the best:

'I knew a girl, young, self-willed, and headstrong,

whose conditions of life brought her into exceptionally frequent and strong temptation. Her mother was the saving influence; but the time came when she died. Some time after her death, the daughter, defiant as she was of God, told me, "The one and only thing that keeps me straight is mother's presence. She is with me often and often: and for her sake I can't go wrong."

A Suffering God.

In his book entitled *Historic Christianity and the Apostles' Creed* (Longmans; 5s. 6d. net)—a book which contains two different sets of addresses which together make a unity, for 'through both the divisions of it there runs the one thought: Christianity is a religion rooted in history, its supernatural character evidenced in the facts of its origins, its oldest creed testifying to this, its essential, nature'—Mr. J. K. Mozley has a wise and useful word about the conception of a suffering God, now so popular.

'The doctrine of the suffering God is untrue, and therefore un-Christian, whenever the suffering is regarded as anything except the result of the free action of the divine will, and of those conditions which depend finally upon the way in which God has exercised His will in creation. However we think of God suffering, we must think of Him as suffering because He wills to suffer, even as He suffered in Christ. The feelings of God cannot be the result of the working of some external force or attraction which God is unable to resist. The divine sympathy is never detachable from the divine will. God freely gives us all things, as He freely gave us His Son. And it is of incomparably less moral and religious importance that I should believe that God is now suffering with my sorrows and pains than that I should believe that I mean so much to God that He gave His Son to die for me. And of the latter I can be sure, as I cannot be sure of the former. It is impossible for me to understand how God suffers with me, and I know that, in any case, suffering must be an entirely inadequate description of that relation of God to myself which means God's will directed towards me; but in the death of Christ I can see God's will concentrated for me and my salvation, and to rest on that is to rest on the securest thing in existence. Even from the point of view of human needs, I believe that in the long run the need of security goes deeper than the need of sympathy.'

The Walnut Shell.

A sign of the times is the foundation of a John Clifford Lectureship. It means that Dr. Clifford has come to his own and World-Brotherhood is coming. Dr. Clifford himself was appointed first lecturer. He lectured on *The Gospel of World Brotherhood according to Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). The lecture was delivered at Newcastle-on-Tyne in September.

They call Dr. Clifford an Octogenarian. He survives it. This book is as fresh and vigorous as anything he ever wrote; it is as instinct with hope. Let us quote the last paragraph:

'Hidden away in a small walnut shell, says a beautiful Arabian story, a diminutive fairy tent was carried by a young prince to his father. First they put it in the council chamber, and it grew till it spread its covering over the king and his senators. Away they carried it to the courtyard, and again it spread till the king and ministers, family and servants, and all the household stood beneath its welcome shade. Next they took it to the plain beyond the city where the multitudinous army was encamped, and marvellous! again it lengthened its cords and strengthened its stakes and spread out its canopy over the far-extending host. It was flexible to every need, expansive to every requirement. Each new demand was met by the display of new and larger capacities. So Christianity came in the contracted shell of Judaism, but burst forth on the day of its appearing over Parthians and Medes, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Jews, and proselytes of every land. Then Peter set it up in the house of Cornelius, and it extended its wonderful awning over all the Gentile world till it sheltered "saints in Cæsar's household," strangers scattered abroad, soldiers and senators, masters and slaves, old men and children. The Greek, in his subtilty, enquires and then accepts its covering; the Roman, in his haughtiness, persecutes and then honours it; the barbarian, in his ignorance, wonders and then adores; men everywhere find it full of the limitless energies of Christ, filled with inexhaustible resources and capable of an expansiveness as broad and deep and high as the growing needs of the human race.'

'This man receiveth sinners.'

Srinagar, the capital of Kashmir is on the Jhelum, and the Jhelum is in flood. The flood sweeps on. Many houses are overwhelmed, and

being built of mud simply drop into the water. 'Those who have been wise are on the hills or in boats. Those who have been unwise are up trees or on the roofs of the houses, calling loudly for help to the passing boats. Among those who are unwise and calling for help is a party of sweepers, the lowest caste of the community. There stand several families, men, women, children, dogs, and hens, hustled together on the roofs of their mud dwellings, which are gradually crumbling away piece by piece into the flood. There are numbers of boats passing, but none will go to their help. Why? Because they are only sweepers, outcasts. The women may tear their hair and weep, and the men cry aloud, but it does not bring boats. Fortunately for them one of the mission school boats, looking for jobs, happens to come their way and at once goes to their rescue. They can only take a few at a time, so they make several journeys, and thus rescue the whole lot of sweepers. As they take these low-caste people along, they meet many boats the inmates of which curse them for defiling their caste, but our fellows enjoy their curses and give them cheers instead. A boat in any flood is of value, but a boat with a crew above caste in a Kashmir flood is priceless.'

The illustration is found in a book called *Character Building in Kashmir* (C.M.S.; 3s.), which has been written by the Rev. C. E. Tyndale-Biscoe, M.A., Headmaster of Srinagar Boys' High School. The era of dull missionary books is over. This is a most entertaining and invigorating narrative. Mr. Tyndale-Biscoe knows what education *should be*; and he is strong enough to see that it *is*, even in Srinagar.

A Sudden Splendour.

The Rev. David M. McIntyre has written a devotional commentary on the First Epistle of John, though he does not call it a commentary, but modestly, 'Some thoughts on holiness as it is described' in that Epistle. Now the First Epistle of John is the epistle of love, and so the title of the book is *Love's Keen Flame* (Glasgow: John Smith; 6s. net). It is at once a scholar's book and a mature Christian's entrance into the mind of the beloved apostle. And these two—scholarship and spiritual sympathy—make the commentator.

It is illustrated at every turn, and that luminously. For example:

'Frederick Tennyson, dispensing in the church of Kirkby Wharfe the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, saw the wine in the chalice flash and glow. Bending over it, he saw mirrored in the shining cup the face of the Lord. A burst of light behind him had flung upon the sacred symbols the glory of the great window, on which were portrayed in rich colours the scenes of the passion of Christ.

"At the Lord's Table waiting, robed and stoled,
Till all had knelt around, I saw a sign!

In the full chalice sudden splendours shine,
Azure and crimson, emerald and gold.

I stoop'd to see the wonder, when behold!

Within the cup a Countenance Divine

Looked upwards at me through the trembling
wine,

Suffused with tenderest love and grief untold."

So, in these days of achievement and devotion there may have come to many, through the dim blazon of the thorn-encompassed Head, a "sudden splendour" kindling our grey lives in the glory of sacrifice.'

A Diary.

The surprise of the season is *The Diary of Opal Whiteley* (Putnam; 7s. 6d. net). Viscount Grey of Falldon tells the story. A child, whose father and mother were dead, was received into the family of a lumberman called Whiteley and given the name of Opal. She was utterly misunderstood and abominably treated but found comfort in a diary. The diary was written 'on scrap-paper of all sorts—in large part on wrapping-paper and strips torn from bags once containing butcher's meat and given her by a friendly neighbour. When she was over twelve years old, a foster-sister, in a tragic fit of childish temper, unearthed the hiding-place of the diary—a hollow log in the woods—and tore it into a thousand fragments. The work of years seemed destroyed; but Opal, who had treasured its understanding pages, picked up the pitiful scraps and stored them in a secret box. There they lay undisturbed until, after many adventures, she happened to come to the Atlantic office to talk about a publication of a very different character. The editor learned her story bit by bit, and, growing interested, asked her to telegraph for the box, which, since she had left the lumber-camps, and her home had been broken up by the death of Mrs. Whiteley, had been stored in California. It

came, with its myriad fragments, and since then the diarist has spent each day piecing it together, sheet by sheet, each page a kind of picture puzzle, lettered on both sides in coloured chalks, the characters, printed with a child's unskilfulness of hand, nearly an inch high.'

She called her pets by the names of famous men and women, and the puzzle is: Where did she learn these names?

This is how she and the fairies understood one another:

'When the more works was done, I went in a quick soft way to the woods. I made little hops over the bushes—the little bushes—as I did go along. I went along the path until I came near unto the way that does lead to the big old log where is the moss-box. I hid behind a tree when I was almost come there. I so did to wait a wait to see if the fairies were near about. I had not seeing of one about the moss-box.

'I looked looks:about. I looked looks about the old root by the log. I turned a big piece of bark over. Under it was something between two layers of moss tied up with a pink ribbon. I felt glad feels. When I did untie the pink ribbon around the moss, there was lots more of pink ribbons. They did have little cards, and the little card on a nice long piece of pink ribbon said, "For Thomas Chatterton Jupiter Zeus." Another card on a more long piece did say, "For William Shakespeare." Another card on a more short piece did say, "For Lars Porsena of Clusium." And there was a ribbon for Brave Horatius and Isaiah and Elizabeth Barrett Browning and for Mathilde Plantagenet, and there was more.

'I did take them all in my arms and I did go to the mill in the far woods. I so went to show all those pretty pink ribbons to the man that wears grey neckties and is kind to mice. I did show him all the cards that was on them. He was glad. I had seeing of the glad light in his eyes. He and I—we do believe in fairies. Near him to-day was working the man of the long step that whistles most all of the time. He is a man with an understanding soul. When Brave Horatius did get his leg hurt the other day, this man did wash it and mentholatum it, and he wrapped his handkerchief in rounds around it. Brave Horatius has likes for him, too.' Brave Horatius is a sheep dog.

We take the book as it is given. Is it genuine? 'A hae ma doots.'

NEW POETRY.

H. W. Shrewsbury.

Under the title of *Brothers in Art* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), Mr. H. W. Shrewsbury has published a volume of studies in the work of Holman Hunt and Millais. He has reproduced in photogravure one-and-twenty of their paintings, and has given his interpretation of them. He has given his interpretation both in prose and in poetry. And, as interpretation, the poetry is as good as the prose. Here is the sonnet on Holman Hunt's 'The Finding of the Saviour in the Temple':

Well may your keen and searching glances
bend,

White-bearded rabbis, on this beardless boy,
Whose daring words and face lit up with joy
Your own dead creeds, your own cold hearts
transcend.

Too high for you His soaring thoughts extend,
Too deep th' inquiries in His eager lips;
Ye question Him, His burning zeal outstrips
The vain traditions ye would still defend.

Even His mother fails to comprehend

The thoughts that glow in these far-seeing
eyes;

'My Son! My Son! Oh, wist Thou not,' she
cries,

'What fears for Thee beset our journey's end?'
And strangely answered her that Boy of boys,

'And wist not ye'—His smile her hurt
destroys—

'My Father's business every hour employs?'

William Stebbing.

Mr. William Stebbing, M.A., Hon. Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, is a fine classical scholar and an accomplished translator of classical poetry. In *Some Masterpieces of Latin Poetry* (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) he has 'thought' into English verse and published some passages from the poetry of Catullus, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. A fair test of his success would be this from Catullus. Its title is

A GRAVE.

O'er lands and waters many have I passed,
To kiss the tomb wherein thy urn is laid;
That thy ashes may have from me their last
Dues, and may hear the last sad farewell
said.

Hear? No more than they can answer; and
yet—

Dumb though they are, and deaf, 'tis in my
pow'r
Thus to tell my soul I do not forget
All I lost by ill chances of an hour.

'Old-world these my offerings?' cannot tears,
A Brother's, float them to the world beneath?
Cannot love scale barriers, space and years?
Cry, 'For ever Hail!' in the teeth of Death?

Remember, and to greet him? I? how well!

But he? In Lethe bathes he even now.
Who I that hail him am he could not tell;
His eyes the dust sealed, thrown upon his
brow.

Will Foster.

Half Mr. Foster's volume is occupied with a dramatic poem called *Isabelle*. That poem gives the book its title—*Isabelle, and Other Poems* (Grant Richards; 5s.). The smaller pieces are mainly nature and love lyrics, but near the end are a few which touch the War. This is one:

Ah, which shall claim triumphant fate
Amid the battle-flags unfurled?
Shall he who seeks to dominate
Or He who seeks to save the world?

Ye meek ones, rally to His side,
Ye gentle, put stern armour on!
Who for the world once greatly died
That saved world now calls upon.

Lose not an hour; the braggart foe
As his already claims the day!
Arm swift and let the proud fool know
They best can fight who best can pray.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary com-
munications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.